OCT 19 1982

1024-B

Y4. P96/11:97-57

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION NEEDS—ORANGE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

ORIGINAL

[97-57]

COMPLETED

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SURFACE TRANSPORTATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON
PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

NOVEMBER 23, 1981 AT SANTA ANA, CALIF.

Printed for the use of the
Committee on Public Works and Transportation

Y4.P96/11:97-57

98-458 O

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1982

I

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION

JAMES J. HOWARD, New Jersey, *Chairman*

GLENN M. ANDERSON, California
ROBERT A. ROE, New Jersey
JOHN B. BREAUX, Louisiana
NORMAN Y. MINETA, California
ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS, Georgia
JAMES L. OBERSTAR, Minnesota
HENRY J. NOWAK, New York
ROBERT W. EDGAR, Pennsylvania
MARILYN LLOYD BOUQUARD, Tennessee
JOHN G. FARY, Illinois
ROBERT A. YOUNG, Missouri
ALLEN E. ERTEL, Pennsylvania
BILLY LEE EVANS, Georgia
RONNIE G. FLIPPO, Alabama
NICK JOE RAHALL II, West Virginia
DOUGLAS APPLEGATE, Ohio
GERALDINE A. FERRARO, New York
EUGENE V. ATKINSON, Pennsylvania
DONALD JOSEPH ALBOSTA, Michigan
WILLIAM HILL BONER, Tennessee
RON de LUGO, Virgin Islands
GUS SAVAGE, Illinois
FOFO I. F. SUNIA, American Samoa
BUDDY ROEMER, Louisiana
BRIAN J. DONNELLY, Massachusetts
RAY KOGOVSEK, Colorado

DON H. CLAUSEN, California
GENE SNYDER, Kentucky
JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT, Arkansas
BUD SHUSTER, Pennsylvania
BARRY M. GOLDWATER, Jr., California
TOM HAGEDORN, Minnesota
ARLAN STANGELAND, Minnesota
NEWT GINGRICH, Georgia
WILLIAM F. CLINGER, Jr., Pennsylvania
GERALD B. H. SOLOMON, New York
HAROLD C. HOLLENBECK, New Jersey
H. JOEL DECKARD, Indiana
WAYNE GRISHAM, California
JIM JEFFRIES, Kansas
JACK FIELDS, Texas
GUY MOLINARI, New York
E. CLAY SHAW, Jr., Florida
BOB McEWEN, Ohio
FRANK WOLF, Virginia

Subcommittee on Surface Transportation

GLENN M. ANDERSON, California, *Chairman*

ROBERT W. EDGAR, Pennsylvania
ALLEN E. ERTEL, Pennsylvania
NICK JOE RAHALL II, West Virginia
DOUGLAS APPLEGATE, Ohio
EUGENE V. ATKINSON, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM HILL BONER, Tennessee
HENRY J. NOWAK, New York
ROBERT A. YOUNG, Missouri
BILLY LEE EVANS, Georgia
DONALD JOSEPH ALBOSTA, Michigan
RON de LUGO, Virgin Islands
GUS SAVAGE, Illinois
FOFO I. F. SUNIA, American Samoa
BRIAN J. DONNELLY, Massachusetts
RAY KOGOVSEK, Colorado
JOHN B. BREAUX, Louisiana
JAMES J. HOWARD, New Jersey,
Ex Officio

BUD SHUSTER, Pennsylvania
GENE SNYDER, Kentucky
TOM HAGEDORN, Minnesota
ARLAN STANGELAND, Minnesota
NEWT GINGRICH, Georgia
WILLIAM F. CLINGER, Jr., Pennsylvania
H. JOEL DECKARD, Indiana
JACK FIELDS, Texas
GUY MOLINARI, New York
E. CLAY SHAW, Jr., Florida
BOB McEWEN, Ohio
DON H. CLAUSEN, California,
Ex Officio

CONTENTS

TESTIMONY

Page
Clark, Ralph B., chairman, Orange County Board of Supervisors 30
Gill, Jack, chairman, Orange County Transportation Commission Citizens Advisory Committee 56
Griset, Hon. Don, councilman, city of Santa Ana; member, Orange County Transportation Commission; and member, Orange County Transit District Board of Directors 12
Heckeroth, Heinz, district director, Department of Transportation, State of California 57
Jenkins, Tom, director, Orange County Transportation Commission 12
Kremer, Peter, Orange County Transportation Coalition 4
Luxembourger, Robert W., vice mayor, city of Santa Ana, Calif 48
Riley, Tom, chairman, Orange County Transportation Commission 12
Roosevelt, Hon. James, commissioner, Orange County Transportation Commission 12
Ross, Malcom, chairman, Transportation Council, Orange County Chamber of Commerce 4
Wilson, A. J., city manager, city of Santa Ana, Calif 48
    Prepared statement 44

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION NEEDS—ORANGE COUNTY, CALIF.

NOVEMBER 23, 1981

House of Representatives,
Subcommittee on Surface Transportation,
Committee on Public Works and Transportation,
Santa Ana, Calif.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 9:50 a.m. in the Santa Ana City Council chambers, Santa Ana, Calif., Hon. Glenn M. Anderson (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Also present: Representative Jerry M. Patterson.

Mr. **Anderson**. The meeting of the Subcommittee on Surface Transportation will come to order.

I am pleased to be here in Santa Ana today with my colleague Jerry Patterson to discuss the transportation needs of Orange County.

I might say before beginning the hearing that Jerry and I were working late in Washington in the session last night until about 9 p.m. I called him and I said, "Jerry, we have a hearing tomorrow. Should we go to Santa Ana or should we not? It is up to you."

He said, "I made some commitments. I think we should be there."

So we flew in this morning. And I left him about 2 o'clock this morning. He was heading one direction, I was heading the other. So I want you to know that we are here because Jerry felt that, because these meetings have been scheduled and we have made commitments to you, we are here.

Early next year, the House Surface Transportation Subcommittee will begin work on a multiyear highway transit bill. This will be important legislation, legislation which will help determine the shape of the Nation's transportation network for decades.

Before we really embark on this task, though, there is thought that we needed to get away from Washington and see what the problems and the needs of the Nation's transportation systems really are. People can't always travel 3,000 miles to Washington to tell us about their needs. It is just as difficult, if not impossible, for us to understand all the problems from Washington. It is also sometimes difficult for us to recognize the solutions from that vantage point.

Knowing that, your Congressman here in Santa Ana, Jerry Patterson, invited us to come out and see Orange County and to hear your thoughts on the direction in which our Federal transportation programs ought to be heading, on the impact which these programs have on you here, and finally on the impact which you would like these programs to have upon you here.

Although we will have several of these field hearings, I am particularly interested on the one today. I mention that, of course, because the district which I represent is right up the road in the harbor area of Los Angeles County. I am also interested because it seems to me that Orange County is seen nationally as part of the Nation that seldom turns to Washington to play a role in local affairs.

I think that we all recognize that when it comes to transportation, costs are so high that local governments simply cannot carry the burden themselves. So I will be curious, frankly, to see how you balance these two concerns. And, frankly, I have struggled with this balance myself. For years I have been advocating a balanced Federal budget, but I have also come to recognize that this can't be done at the expense of allowing our transportation infrastructure to whither. So it is only then with some difficulty that I have come to be somewhat critical of the administration's budget cuts with respect to our highway and public transit programs.

I am sure that you will hear more about these cuts later. But first, let me welcome a good friend and an outstanding Member of the Congress, Jerry Patterson.

Mr. PATTERSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am very pleased that you came with me on the redeye last night to be here for the hearing. It shows your dedication and interest. I would like to call attention to the fact that this isn't unusual for Glenn Anderson. He returns to the State about three weekends out of four either to be with his constituents or to hold hearings in various parts of the country. I would estimate that at least 50 percent of the time he rides the redeye. This time I think we are probably going to ride the redeye both ways, depending on what takes place back in Washington. He is a younger man than I am. I can't take this redeye schedule.

Again, we are very delighted to have Chairman Glenn Anderson from the House Subcommittee on Surface Transportation of the Committee on Public Works, and his staff who are here today who have done the advance work and are here at the table with us. We welcome them as well. The subcommittee staff does a lot of the real work here in terms of preserving the record and recording it and making certain that it goes back to Washington with us.

We had several other Members of Congress who would have been here today had they not faced the same dilemma that we faced. But the record will, of course, be made available to all members of that subcommittee and the full committee, as well as Members on the House floor, assuming the legislation finds its way—and I think it will—to the House floor.

The subcommittee has done some outstanding work in the area of transportation, particularly in view of the rather drastic cutbacks in transportation.

We are here today to consider a subject of very great importance to my constituents and to all of Orange County. For most of us, at one time or another, we found ourselves captive to the Santa Ana Freeway during rush hour traffic. This morning's hearing has special significance to those people.

The Santa Ana Freeway was originally constructed in the 1950's to serve a low-density city population and provide an interregional route between San Diego, Orange County, and Los Angeles County. No one could possibly have envisioned at that time the phenomenal rate of growth that was to occur in Orange County during the coming decades.

In 1940, for example, Orange County's population was 131,000 people. In 1950, it was only 216,000 people. Today it is approximately 2 million people. By 1995, it will be 2.5 million to 3 million.

While the population of Los Angeles County has increased 2½ times during the last 35 years, Orange County has increased 13 times. By any measure, Orange County has experienced an unprecedented rate of growth. It can no longer be regarded simply as a stopover between Los Angeles and San Diego. It must be viewed as a highly urbanized vibrant and growing county.

The Santa Ana Freeway corridor in Orange County has become increasingly dependent on the Santa Ana Freeway as its primary transportation artery. Today the Santa Ana Freeway is the major population and employment corridor in Orange County. For example, fully one-half of the county's residents and almost 70 percent of the county's jobs can be found within 3 miles of the Santa Ana Freeway.

The difficulty we face at the present is the freeway is rapidly becoming obsolete both in terms of carrying capacity and anticipated design life. Heavy congestion on Interstate 5 is now prevalent during peak traffic hours and increasing during midday hours and on weekends.

A 1977 Caltrans study concluded that major portions of Interstate 5 through Orange County are at breakdown condition, severe congestion, less than 20 miles-per-hour average speed during peak hours. During the next 15 years the population of Orange County is going to increase again by more than 25 percent.

At the same time, because of the rapid growth in jobs and household incomes, the number of daily trips is expected to nearly double. What this means is that the demand to use the Santa Ana Freeway will be substantially greater then than it is today.

I hope we accomplish at this morning's hearing the identification of problems associated with the Santa Ana corridor, consider the alternatives for addressing those problems, and consider what can be done in a cooperative effort before the Federal, State and local governments, so that the Santa Ana Freeway will continue to serve Orange County residents well into the next century.

Having briefly set this backdrop, let me once again thank Chairman Glenn Anderson for his interest and for his participation in scheduling this hearing, and really for his above and beyond the call of duty in being here today. I welcome the staff members of the subcommittee and all the members of the audience who will testify, as well as those who are here as interested citizens. I welcome you here this morning.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Anderson**. Thank you, Jerry, for the very nice welcome.

I shall introduce the staff members up here. First, Mrs. Ruth Costello, staff assistant for our Public Works and Transportation Committee. Next, Larry Reida, the chief minority counsel. Next is

Clyde Woodle, the chief engineer for the House Public Works and Transportation Committee; and Paul Schlesinger, professional staff member for the committee.

The first topic this morning is Orange County growth and the importance of transportation. Our first witness is Malcolm Ross from the Orange County Chamber of Commerce.

TESTIMONY OF MALCOM ROSS, REPRESENTING THE ORANGE COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE; PETER KREMER, REPRESENTING THE ORANGE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COALITION

Mr. Ross. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Good morning, Mr. Chairman and staff, and welcome to Orange County. I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for taking the time out of your very, very busy schedule to be with us this morning.

I have the pleasure of representing the business community before you today, and I bring your greetings from the chamber's president, Richard Holgren, and from its president and chief executive officer, Lucian Truhill.

The Orange County Chamber of Commerce finds itself in a dilemma: On the one hand, we are stalwart supporters of President Reagan's efforts to bring fiscal responsibility to the Federal Government; on the other we support the continuation of a total transportation system as a national priority.

We are all aware of the importance of adequate transportation systems to the health of the Nation's business and commerce. The transportation system is the artery through which all goods must flow. It is also the artery through which employees of the Nation's businesses must flow to and from their workplaces.

I fear that Orange County's arteries are becoming clogged and are in need of restorative surgery. While Orange County has experienced remarkable growth and presently enjoys a healthy economy, we see the handwriting on the wall. We have two complex and interrelated problems: Housing and transportation.

The chamber has recently adopted a strongly worded position that private enterprise continues to be the best solution for ameliorating the county's housing problems. However, the situation is different when it comes to transportation. The government has traditionally been the provider of highway and transit systems, and these systems are essential to the continuing economic health of our area and must continue to be government services.

We do need—and let me emphasize that again—we do need to emphasize user charges to finance them. And consistent with this position, the chamber supported and worked for passage of the recent gas tax increase passed by our State legislature.

Our housing problem, however, will only be compounded if funding of major highway improvements is passed along to home buyers through development fees, a trend that has started in this county. At a time when Orange County business is finding difficulties in recruiting workers due to housing costs, we cannot ask potential employees to pick up the cost of a transportation system that benefits all of Orange County, the State and the Nation.

Furthermore, Orange County is a tax-exporting county. We believe it is reasonable and just that our fair share of these tax revenues are returned. We, therefore, request you to continue the support of construction and maintenance of the Nation's transportation system. In particular, we ask your support in funding for reconstruction of Interstate 5 in Orange County.

You will be hearing in some detail from others testifying this morning about our existing and projected freeway and arterial congestion problems. You will hear about the need to completely reconstruct our most heavily used freeway, I-5, the Santa Ana Freeway. You will hear a great deal about these transportation problems.

I would like to mention a few of the impacts of these problems on Orange County's businesses. First, the business community is becoming increasingly aware of the trouble workers are having getting to their jobs. Congestion makes it extremely time consuming and costly to get to and from work. Absenteeism is becoming a problem, especially among transit-dependent workers as our present bus system is relatively new and underdeveloped and must use the same overcrowded road system that is used by autos and trucks. So bus transit is really not attractive enough to pull auto users out of their automobiles.

Second, business is having trouble attracting new workers due to freeway congestion.

Third, transport of goods is becoming increasingly time consuming and therefore costly.

Finally, a trend is surfacing for businesses to move out of the country and for business expansions to be located elsewhere. And to compound the above, the word is out that Orange County has transportation problems and this, to say the least, dampens the enthusiasm of businesses wishing to move into Orange County.

Therefore, we seek your help in continuing Federal funding for our transportation system construction and maintenance. We must begin immediately to solve our congestion problems, and most particularly the problems related to the I-5 corridor.

Our transit district tells us they can tighten their belts and delay expansion for the short term. But our highway system cannot.

As you know, Orange County's contribution to the gross national product is one of the highest in the Nation. And to continue this high rate of productivity we must improve Interstate 5 as well as the interrelated transportation system throughout the county.

The business community knows that investment of Federal funds in solving the county's transportation problem is a wise investment, as the return on this investment will be in the form of benefits not only to Orange County but to State and Nation as well.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. With your permission, I would like to present the next speaker, Mr. Peter Kremer.

Mr. **Anderson**. Would you also stay up here because I will have a couple of questions to ask you.

Mr. **Ross**. Sure.

Mr. **Anderson**. Peter Kremer, Orange County Transportation Coalition.

Mr. **Kremer**. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, members of the staff, my name is Peter Kremer. I am president of the Irvine Co., and I am testifying before you this morning as a member of the board and active member of the

Orange County Transportation Coalition. This is a group that was formed approximately 3 years ago, and now consists of some 54 employers throughout the county representing well in excess of 100,000 employees and a payroll in excess of $1 billion.

This group now consists of most of the major employers within the country and is a rapidly growing group of business interests.

The Business Transportation Coalition grew out of a concern within the business community about the transportation constraint and a recognition of a very clear interrelationship between transportation system and the healthy overall country economic and statewide situation, and also the link between transportation issues and the housing issues facing this county.

The coalition has supported legislation at the State level to assure adequate funding for the Orange County transportation system, and the coalition is closely monitoring county studies that will address funding alternatives for rehabilitation projects and major new construction projects.

The coalition appreciates the Federal interest in highway funding in general, and specifically Interstate 5 in Orange County which is the county's primary transportation arterial.

It is clear to those of us in business here in the county that the continuing economic vitality in this area is closely tied to solutions in our significant transportation issues. Certainly Interstate 5, the Santa Ana transportation corridor, is one of these significant transportation issues. And we are extremely pleased that the Federal Government is evidencing this shared interest and concern and that they are pursuing some tangible funding solutions to this issue.

Thank you.

Mr. ANDERSON. Thank you very much, Mr. Kremer.

Mr. Ross, my questions will be directed at you, and if you wish Mr. Kremer may also answer.

First, I want to congratulate you on a very excellent statement.

Correct me if I am wrong, but based on your testimony this morning, I sense you feel that Orange County's top transportation priorities are highway improvements chiefly because levels of traffic service right now are much lower than they should be, whereas the need for fixed rail transit improvements is based upon some future demand for services which may not have yet naturalized. Is this a fair characterization of your position, and how would you go about allocating resources between short-range expedient measures and longer range capital investments? Where would you place most of the emphasis?

In other words, sometimes we are asked to spend money right now to do something to cure a right-now problem, when perhaps a longer range approach would solve it better and cheaper in the long run. And I realize that sometimes we are not able to do the latter. I wanted you to kind of maybe give us your thoughts on it.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, our right-now problem, the I-5 corridor, the Santa Ana Freeway corridor is the highest priority in the county, as I see it. The transit situation, of course, is something that in the long term will be very necessary.

I think that if I could do the planning myself I would certainly spend the money immediately to work on the Santa Ana Freeway corridor. But at the same time, sufficient funds should be expended to continue the studies related to the transit facility which someday will have to become a reality.

Mr. **ANDERSON.** In your remarks you also said that you believe that Orange County is a tax-exporting county. Is that true when you factor in all of the large government contracts that are awarded to Orange County corporations, contracts that improve your local tax base and a tax base that could be used to allow you to pay for some of these projects yourself?

Mr. **ROSS.** I believe if you look principally at the gas tax that the county pays to the State and the Federal Government that a great deal of the gas tax funds are spent elsewhere. That was principally wh[illegible] was talking about.

Mr. **ANDERSON.** You were absolutely right on that. We are a donor State, as far as gasoline taxes are concerned. And Orange County is a donor county, as far as that is concerned.

I thought you meant across the board. I was corrected a while back. My district is to the west here, and I have several thousand industries in my district, the Long Beach, Carson, Torrance area. And somebody unfriendly to me did the favor for me of telling me how many contracts I was getting in my district when I was telling how much of our dollars were going to Washington. And I found out I was doing very good in the Long Beach-Torrance area, money coming in, whether it be air frame, electronics. Of course, you do pretty good down here, too.

Mr. **ROSS.** Well, of course, as far as the national economy is concerned, I think the Nation is very fortunate that a large segment of the defense industry is located in an area of hydroproductivity. They certainly have the facilities ready to go to enter into an expanded national defense program.

Mr. **ANDERSON.** Some of these people in Washington now are telling us we should do more of this ourselves locally and that we have the means of doing it perhaps.

Mr. **ROSS.** Of course, we have as a State, as you well know, made the first attempt to do a little financing, a little additional financing ourselves.

Mr. **ANDERSON.** Yes.

Mr. **ROSS.** And as far as local financing is concerned, it is our position that it has been really a government service for a long time, for as far as anybody can remember, to furnish transportation systems.

Mr. **ANDERSON.** Now buses do travel on clogged highways. And as you say, if they don't have lanes of their own—have you given any thought to the construction of what we call HOV lanes, high occupancy vehicle lanes, that serve as express routes for buses and car pools?

Mr. **ROSS.** Yes, sir. I believe if you or your staff become familiar with the studies that are ongoing related to the Santa Ana Freeway corridor, you will find that HOV lanes and fixed rail, fixed guideway type arrangements are all being considered and studied.

Mr. **ANDERSON.** I mentioned my area a while ago and even areas further west than mine, the Los Angeles area, particularly among some of the larger corporate interests there has been a genuine concerted effort to build and improve upon their ride-sharing network. I believe they recognize that these employers of large number of employees have a responsibility to facilitate car pooling or van pooling within their own work force. Do you know of such efforts in Orange County to do this?

Mr. **Ross**. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I think that a study of Orange County's major businesses—and I am sure that Mr. Kremer could enlarge upon this—I am sure a study would show that they are one of the forerunners in the country of van pooling and ride-sharing programs.

One concern in particular that I know of, the Fluor Corp. has, as I understand it, the highest number of vans for employee use of any corporation in the United States.

Peter, would you like to enlarge on that?

Mr. **Kremer**. Mr. Chairman, I will amplify that the Business Transportation Coalition is emphasizing a lot of various solutions to our transportation needs, and certainly we are focusing in on one of the issues, the Santa Ana corridor today. But van pooling and transportation management programs of all sorts are being pursued very aggressively within the business community.

Also I would like to emphasize that we agree that many of the solutions should be brought about by user-pay solutions and even the possibility of local taxation. We are not suggesting that the Federal Government or the Federal and State governments have the sole responsibility for funding all of the solutions to our county's transportation needs.

This hearing, however, is focusing on a particular aspect of our transportation needs where it is very difficult for us to see solutions that come purely locally or from a user-pay situation.

Mr. **Anderson**. I am going to relinquish my time now to Congressman Patterson.

Mr. **Patterson**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Let me ask if both of you would stay there for just a moment.

First of all, I would like to thank each of you for amending your busy schedules to come down today and testify before the subcommittee. I think it has been very helpful because each of you not only represents the Orange County Chamber of Commerce but also the Orange County Transportation Coalition, two very important organizations with regard to transportation issues at large. Additionally because each of you represent rather significant landed interests in both housing and commercial shopping centers and other similar investments and therefore have a very strong stake in the future of this country.

Mr. Ross stated—and I guess I would like to know your response, Mr. Kremer, to the connection between housing and transportation. He indicated that there are really two problems in terms of progress and future growth for Orange County; housing and transportation.

Further, he indicated that housing was not an issue that the chamber was focusing on as a public question, but that transportation was. I am curious, if you would agree with that and also if the Orange County Transportation Coalition and/or the Irvine Co. has some views on the housing-transportation connection in terms of what that might mean for Orange County?

Mr. **Kremer**. We do have very definite views on that. I think it is quite obvious that the transportation and the housing affordability issues are very intertwined. This county, I believe, is facing today and certainly will be in the future a very serious constraint regarding the affordability of housing. And this is aggrevating the transportation problem significantly because of all the employees that have to commute in and out of our country.

It seems to us that the solutions to transportation are closely allied with the solutions to the housing issue. And although our Transportation Coalition was initially formed with a very clear cut single objective in mind, transportation, at our board meetings and our membership meetings, we are finding that the topics of housing are coming up, and it seems to me that we should be facing both of those issues simultaneously.

Mr. **Patterson**. Thank you.

Mr. Ross, you indicated that Orange County is a major contributor to the GNP, the gross national product. I don't know whether you have that data with you today, but if you do, I think it would be helpful to illustrate what proportion of the GNP comes from Orange County. I didn't even know we had a breakdown on it.

Mr. **Ross**. I don't have the percentages this morning. But I do know that the 1981 projected GNP for Orange County is in the neighborhood of $36 billion. And I believe that that is up from last year, which was like $27 billion. It is a substantial increase in productivity in this county.

Mr. **Patterson**. That is good. The economy isn't suffering.

Each of you, really, is from a company that, in some respects, has more interest in the San Diego Freeway which, of course, is a freeway that is newer and has more lanes and is operating somewhat better than the Santa Ana Freeway. So, I would like to thank you for coming here to testify on behalf of the broader interests of Orange County at large and perhaps the most congested problem, the Santa Ana Freeway.

I would ask each of you if you feel the Santa Ana Freeway is the highest in terms of traffic congestion in the county? If I could please get a response on that.

Mr. **Ross**. Mr. Patterson, I certainly would suggest that the problems related to the Interstate 5 corridor, Santa Ana Freeway corridor, are the worst problems in the county. We have many problems, and we are going to continue to have problems, but that certainly can be singled out as the most important issue as far as we are concerned.

Mr. **Patterson**. Mr. Kremer?

Mr. **Kremer**. Jerry, I would just add that I think it is important for all of us who are looking at and trying to deal with these transportation issues, that we look at it in an overall regional way, and the problems that are very severe in the Santa Ana corridor, have a significant impact in other areas. Certainly, it is much more serious than the San Diego Freeway. It is difficult to single out one specific element of our transportation problem.

Certainly, the two transportation corridors, the San Joaquin Hills, and the Foothill Transportation Corridors, are also extremely significant in finding solutions to our regional needs.

But I believe it is very important that we look at this in an overall basis, and not look at things just on a very localized nature.

Mr. Patterson. Thank you, Peter and Malcolm.

Mr. Anderson. Mr. Kremer, the passage of proposition A, I think it was, in Los Angeles County, last November, creating a new half-penny sales tax for transit, wouldn't have occurred without corporate involvement. It was pretty much agreed upon.

Has your group given any thought to supporting such a measure in the Orange County area?

Mr. Kremer. We have given a lot of thought, and we definitely feel that in the future, solutions such as local taxation, either an increased county sales tax or gasoline tax, will become politically viable.

And this is certainly one of the solutions that I think we need to look toward. We cannot rely, we feel we must not rely totally on Federal and State funding of our transportation problems. It just, in the post-prop 13 era, that is not going to be a viable solution, and we would certainly feel that in the future, some form of county-wide local option is going to be a realistic part of the solution.

Mr. Anderson. Have your members generally supported the administration's proposed budget cuts, and I would assume they have, and in that light, I would have to point out that these cuts included about $1 billion in highway spending. This will not help to get I-5 expanded, and I might say that I was a speaker to the Associate General Contractors Convention in Louisville, early October, and I suppose that of the group in attendance, several hundred contractors there, I suppose that almost all of them were supporters of the Reagan policy in general.

But again, I pointed out that highways are something special, particularly out interstate system. When you allow something to deteriorate, the costs of repairing it go up geometrically as the deterioration works on. If you catch it when it is just starting to deteriorate, you can fix it fairly cheaply.

But if you let it go, it just get much higher, then if you let it go much further, it just goes way out of proportion, and it just isn't wise not to maintain our interstate system, and not to maintain our highway system.

As it is, plus the needed construction, like you people are advocating. And following my discussion with them, they sent me a very nice letter commending me on the position, and of course, they said, yes, they did support the administration's program in general, but that they felt that they were wrong in cutting on the highway and transit needs, and that they have taken their position to the administration, urging that they not cut the highway needs in this country, particularly the interstate.

And I thought maybe I would bring that to you and see how you people discuss this at all. I spoke to the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce recently, along the same line. I told them that, they being, I assume, fairly close to the President, should be indicating their—that you can support something 95 percent, but once in a while you have got to show where maybe they are wrong. And I think they are wrong on highways.

Mr. Ross. Yes, I am sure that the board would agree with that position, Mr. Chairman. It is a question of priorities, an we feel that the transportation network is really part of the survival technique for the country that wants to maintain its growth. In a healthy economy, you simply must maintain that highway network, freeways particularly.

I think that the remarks that you have just stated are certainly remarks that the chamber would support, and can support.

Mr. Anderson. Larry, do you have any questions?

Larry Reida represents the minority here today. He is the chief minority counsel.

Mr. Reida. Well, I will have to say that if there is one area where the Republicans and the Democrats are in total agreement that is the highway program. There is concern on our side of the aisle, as you well know, Mr. Chairman, and that is using the trust fund for purposes other than the trust fund.

We do have a dedicated user tax in setting up the highway trust fund, and although there is actually a surplus in that fund, there is a device called obligational ceilings. The administration has been able, through the unified budget process, to cut down the overall Federal deficit. It has long been the position of the senior Republicans on our committee that this is an inappropriate way to keep books.

And if you are going to balance the budget, you ought to balance it general revenue-wise rather than using the surplus funds in either the airport or the highway trust funds to do it.

Mr. Anderson. I might point out, and adding to what Larry has said, that we are pretty much a bipartisan committee, and when I mention that, it is not just this administration that is doing it, it started under Johnson, it was continued under Nixon and Ford and Carter and now Reagan. They are all using trust fund money to help balance the budget. We think that is wrong. We think trust fund money should be spent and used for what the trust fund is set up for.

Mr. Ross. We certainly would support that line of thinking, definitely.

Mr. Anderson. Any further questions?

Thank you very much for an excellent presentation.

Our next witnesses are a panel, Santa Ana Freeway corridor and 4-R, moderated by Jimmy Roosevelt.

Appearing, are Supervisor Riley; Tom Jenkins, director of the OCTC; and Councilman Griset.

We are very happy to have former Congressman Roosevelt here. I still call him Congressman, but I have known Jimmy for many years, and was suprised when he showed the intelligence to wind up in this beautiful county of Orange. I never thought he would do it, be he did it. Jimmy, we are very happy to have you here, and he and I have talked several times on this matter.

So, Mr. Roosevelt, I will turn the panel over to you. Maybe you will want to welcome him, too, Jerry, because he may be a constituent of yours.

Mr. Patterson. He is not a constituent of mine. He is in a higher rent district.

Mr. **Anderson**. From my vantage point, Orange County is all high rent.

Mr. **Patterson**. This is an esteemed panel, Mr. Chairman, as you know, and it is a pleasure to have Congressman Roosevelt here to be the moderator. I would like to welcome all the members, Supervisor Riley, good to see you; Tom Jenkins; my old buddy, Dan Griset. Who is holding down the fort in Santa Ana? Good to have all of you with us today.

Mr. **Anderson**. Jimmy, the floor is yours.

TESTIMONY OF JAMES ROOSEVELT, PANEL MODERATOR, SANTA ANA FREEWAY CORRIDOR AND 4-R; TOM RILEY, CHAIRMAN, ORANGE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION; TOM JENKINS, DIRECTOR, OCTC; AND DAN GRISET, COUNCILMAN

Mr. **Roosevelt**. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and Congressmen, members of the staff of the subcommittee. Of course, I would like to add my welcome and express my appreciation for your presence here today, and Mr. Chairman, I would like just to add that I think the main reason I am here in Orange County is that my wife was looking for a place for us to move to where she was sure I wouldn't run for office, because I couldn't get elected.

Mr. **Anderson**. I am sure glad you are not in my district.

Mr. **Roosevelt**. We believe that in Orange County, as in the Nation at large, transportation is inherently linked to the problems of economic development, energy, inflation, housing, congestion, and pollution.

We believe that Orange County's economic survival is dependent upon the personal mobility of its residents. Further, while locally we found ourselves projecting growth and continued development, we also foresee a rapid deterioration of our economic vitality unless we positively address the central issue. And that, of course, is transportation.

The consequences of denying needed transportation facility improvements may be pennywise and are certainly pound foolish. We are optimistic that our hearing today will serve to focus attention on not only the critical condition of Interstate 5 here in Orange County—we picked a good day for you to see it, because I understand there was quite a pileup way down and up today on 5—but the need for immediate attention to the entire Federal highway program.

Our responsibility, as a transportation planning and programing agency, is to identify the problem, seek out viable alternative solutions, and present them to the decisionmakers like yourselves.

Nothing short of a joint effort between Federal, State, and local governments, will mean any kind of success. While the focus of the Orange County Transportation Commission presentation today is on the pending Federal highway reauthorization legislation. We are also vitally concerned with the reauthorization of Federal transit programs.

We testified before this subcommittee, or rather some of us did, others beside myself, at your July transit hearings. And will continue to work with you over the coming months to develop sound transit reauthorization legislation. We very much appreciate the opportunity of having this panel with us today, and I would, at this point, like to introduce Supervisor Tom Riley, who is chairman of the Orange County Transportation Commission, who will give you an overview of the Santa Ana corridor study under way.

Mr. ANDERSON. Supervisor Riley?

Mr. RILEY. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Surface Transportation Subcommittee. It is indeed a great pleasure for me to join the others here, and welcome you to fabulous Orange County.

I would like to take the opportunity of your visit to our county, to fill you in on how we have gone about identifying our most pressing transportation problems. We at the Orange County Transportation Commission may have undertaken studies such as the Orange County multimodal transportation study, and the Santa Ana transportation corridor, which is Interstate 5, alternative analysis.

These have been done in conjunction with the Orange County Transportation District, and other local, regional, State, and Federal governmental agencies to examine in detail the impacts, cost, and benefits of alternate solutions to our transportation problem.

The evaluation conducted in our multimodal transportation study has been refined for Orange County's major transportation corridor, through the Santa Ana transportation corridor alternatives analysis study, currently under way.

Stage 1 of this alternative analysis was recently completed. And we are working on the more detailed stage 2 effort. The recommendations stemming from the transportation needs identified in stage 1, the Santa Ana transportation corridor and alternative analysis, confirmed the need to evaluate transit, highway, computer rail, and transportation system management improvements.

Specially, stage 1 identified the highway and transit improvement options within the corridor for detailed evaluations in stage 2 to be. Option 1, widening Interstate 5 from six to eight at-grade lanes. And the preliminary capital costs for this widening is estimated at $394 million in 1980 dollars.

Option 2, a rapid transit starter line in the Santa Ana transportation corridor, which will effectively link the central-county, high-density activity centers, such as facilities as estimated to range between $485 and $663 million in 1980 dollars, depending on the ultimate right-of-way alinement, station facilities configuration, and the technology selected.

Option 3, transportation system management improvements, including arterial street improvements, ramp metering, and auxiliary lanes and expansion of the local express bus system from 800 to 1,000 large buses.

The preliminary capital cost for these projects is estimated to be $467 million in 1980 dollars.

Option 4, computer rail improvements, including station improvements, rolling stock, double tracking, and grate separations for which the total 1980 estimate is $672 million.

Now, this estimate, approximately $200 million, would be for double-tracking needs to accommodate freight and passenger rail movements, and $180 million would be for grade separations.

The balance would be for station improvements and rolling stock.

Over the next 18 months, we will be conducting a detailed evaluation of these transportation improvement options, with the assistance of public participation, we expect to adopt a program of projects in the spring of 1983. We will then move into an implementation phase.

At this time, we would like to present a short slide presentation, which will aid you in gaining a better perspective of Orange County's transportation problems, and potential solutions within the context of the State and Nation.

I would like to introduce Mr. Tom Jenkins, executive director of the Orange County Transportation Commission, for this purpose.

Mr. **Roosevelt**. You may, Mr. Chairman. We would also like to express our appreciation to the staff for the cooperation that our staff has had with yours, and we are very grateful for it.

Mr. **Anderson**. Thank you.

Mr. Jenkins?

Mr. **Jenkins**. Mr. Chairman, Congressman Patterson, members of the staff, I would just like to give you a brief presentation on the background of Orange County, the transportation problems within the Santa Ana corridor, and it being the highest priority corridor in the county, and a little bit more explanation as to some of the technical issues.

Both Congressman Patterson and some previous speakers have talked about some of the activities in the Santa Ana corridor; some feel we ought to probably get back to this, association of general contractors on those. Some of the early days in Orange County; come from a rural county into a major urban county, with a variety of housing, high density, low density.

Hi-rise development; the change in population over the last 40 years. Mr. Patterson mentioned this in his earlier remarks, from a small county in the early forties and fifties to—with the 1980 census, we are about population 1.9 million. As time marches on, 1981, we are over the population 2 million mark.

The population growth since 1940, even with the large increases in population in other counties, Orange County still outstripped most of them in population growth. We are now the sixth largest county in the country in population, based on the 1980 census.

I just might reiterate that Los Angeles, as a county, is first; and San Diego County is the seventh. And the three counties combined represent 5 percent of the population of the United States. I always find that a very interesting statistic when we are both talking here, in Sacramento, and in Washington.

The highway-related—let's go back a minute.

As our growth has come over the years, the congestion on our transportation facilities has become quite great. The freeways have been changed in complexity; we used to be a bedroom community for Los Angeles, now we have more people commuting to Orange County for jobs than we have commuting out of Orange County to other parts of the region. The growth forecasts, just looking at what we expect to happen over the next few years, the 1976 base, there is the year when we started our long-range planning study, and looking at the forecast year of 1995, a growth of population projected to about 2.6 million, and more than doubling of jobs, and more than a doubling of daily trips.

Along with this, our freeways have become more and more congested, even with increases in our system. The arterial streets are now becoming clogged, much to the concern to our cities, as well as to all the travelers. Responding to this, the Orange County Transportation Commission did one of the first long-range studies in the State. It has been conducted over the last 10 to 15 years.

Looking at what our needs would be, and the future, looking at increased capacity on all the freeways, and some of the discussions were whether we were looking at high-occupancy vehicle lanes; those are being projected as a possibility for every one of the freeways.

Additional new corridors, as Mr. Kremer talked about, in some of the southern parts of the county, we also have needs within the central part of the county.

We are also looking at a multimodal solution, not all highways, but a major investment in the area of transit. Out of the multimodal study, it confirmed the obvious to everybody in the county, that our major problem is Interstate 5, and the related activities along Interstate 5, the Santa Ana corridor.

We have extensive technical data related to the level of service, the average speed is somewhere, during most of the time, less than 20 miles an hour, through most of the segment of the facility in Orange County. We have recurrent congestion, anywhere up to 12 hours of the day in the central part of the county.

The—out of that analysis, it was agreed with both the Federal Government, the State and local agencies that we should go into an alternatives analysis, looking at the major solutions that could be done on the facility. We have looked at different alternatives, including HOV lanes, rapid transit guideways, commuter rail, highway widening, transportation system management activities, which Mr. Riley mentioned in his testimony.

The Santa Ana corridor is outlined on this slide. I think Mr. Patterson mentioned some of the statistics on it. It represents over half the population of the county, and almost two-thirds of the jobs in the county. And that corridor is approximately 3 miles on each side of Interstate 5, and includes the Los Angeles-San Diego Amtrak line; it includes major development centers; it is a major freight artery for trucking.

The volumes carried on I-5 are almost double those than what it was originally designed. It carried, on the average, approximately 20,000 trucks per day, and the trucks themselves comprise about 13 percent of the daily vehicular traffic.

And freight being one of the major concerns to county, both on the highway side, as well as the rail freight issue, on the Santa Fe. Of course, Orange County being a major recreation area, this also makes the freeway even more active on the times on the weekends. The weekend travel is on the order of 80 percent of the average weekday volumes. And this is generally unheard of on urban freeways.

The solutions out of the stage 1 analysis, and in your packet, you received a summary of that, and there is a truckload of technical data which, as usual, back that up. But we tried to concisely put it in about 50 pages.

And that is one of our shorter versions. The solution recommended out of the first phase of the analysis really talks about a multimodal solution. I think this points up if we did things like we used to in the planning in the fifties and the sixties, the Santa Ana Freeway would require on the order of something like 14 travel lanes, which is probably very unreasonable and unlikely that that would happen.

Some of you have traveled, on the committee, the Dan Ryan Expressway in Chicago, on the south side. It is something that has 14 lanes. It is a rather massive facility. We had also figured that by widening to 14 lanes, you would probably eliminate most of the demand for the facility, because of the right-of-way acquisition.

So we have looked at a solution, being a multimodal solution, and this is why, from a funding basis, and everything else, we need to look at options from the financing area. We are looking at rapid transit as more buses, widen and rebuild the Santa Ana Freeway; new corridors for consideration; and of course, improve street arterial systems.

The system recommendations talk about a combination. The rapid transit corps is in the red. The commuter rail improvements along the yellow, the Santa Fe line. The freeway reconstruction and widening of I-5, in the green, and then an associated transportation system management improvements to streets systems intersecting and feeding the corridor.

We are now into stage 2, which is a comprehensive look at the alternatives, and coming out with a draft environmental impact statement and a selection of projects. The fixed guideway recommendations, we are looking at a medium-capacity guideway in the old Pacific Electric corridor, and the central corridor, hopefully we will use more modern equipment than was used in the early days.

This is the San Diego new light rail line, the San Diego Trolley, the equipment that has been put in place and started in operation in July. We are also looking strongly at a connection to Los Angeles, with the help of Los Angeles County, and their representatives. A connection from Orange County as well as serving residents within our county.

Some idea of the employment centers, we do not have a large single employment concentration. We have multi-center, South Coast Plaza area, the Irvine Industrial Complex around John Wayne Airport, Central Santa Ana, where you are today; the Anaheim area; then on down to the more southern part of the county, where the San Diego and Santa Ana Freeways meet at Irvine Center, and the Irvine Industrial Complex East.

The rapid transit line is projected to respond to the activities in that major corridor within the central part of the county. The blob, one reason there is sort of a blob there, is that there part of stage 2 is to look at specific alinements connecting that. Why there is a single line moving toward the Los Angeles County area, that is the Pacific Electric right-of-way in which 7 miles of the old, abandoned right-of-way by Southern Pacific has been purchased by the Orange County Transit District.

And we would envision that as being one of the major connection points to Los Angeles.

The other aspect, in addition to the highway program and the rapid transit, is commuter rail, looking at trying to get a little bit of everything into the solutions, 15-minute frequencies, increased capacity; also taking into account that we must maintain an adequate level of freight service.

The Orange County Chamber of Commerce has reminded me many times that as one consideration that we must maintain in our analyses, in the Santa Ana corridor, is the aspects of freight and commodity movements.

Looking at some of the new stations within the county, currently there are passenger rail stations in San Clemente, San Juan Capistrano, Santa Ana, and Fullerton. A new one has been approved in Anaheim; we are looking for State funding at Irvine Center, and the Mission Viejo Station, and two new stations we are looking at in the Buena Park area and central Irvine.

These would provide stations at about a 5-mile separation. Related to the highway improvements, the widening of Santa Ana Freeway to eight lanes, we seem to be the bottleneck in the system now. We have a six-lane freeway section within the central part of the county; talking about widening that to eight lanes within the right-of-way, and consideration of that additional lane would be possibly a high-occupancy vehicle lanes or something like that during peak hours.

Also, looking at developing parallel corridors in the south county, all the TSM measures related to the arterial street system.

The bus system, as part of those measures, looking at a full transportation system management area of expanding the bus system, the park-and-ride interface, the ramp metering—that is just one of my pet peeves, buses shouldn't have to stop at the ramp meter, but we are working that out with Caltrans, in this case, to provide bypasses at all entries.

Just to reiterate, the cost, it seems to be rather staggering at times to people, but the investment in that facility and the amount of people it will move in the future, today and in the future, has warranted such an investment. We are also looking at the combination of funds, both Federal, State, and local.

The key Federal concerns, to reiterate some of the reasons we are here today, we are interested in the Interstate 4-R program, related to the Santa Ana Freeway, from the transit area, a fair share of the operating funds, whatever that might be in the future. In the transit capital, we want to be sure we are not left out of future legislation for rapid transit facilities, and also in the Amtrak area.

Just to reiterate some of the—specifically, related to highways, we are supporting emphasis on the interstate reconstruction program, the 4-R, bring facilities—is part of that, be allowed to bring facilities up to the current design standards, and make sure we have a minimum of eight lanes in the urbanized areas.

Some of the proposals have been to restrict that to six lanes as basic design standards, and also to make sure that the freeway and interstate system is compatible with the State and local road system interfaces, especially the interchanges and other overcrosses.

I would, in closing, I would just like to state that I will be able to answer questions after this is over. I would like to introduce Councilman Dan Griset, and, as I mentioned, I would be happy to respond to any questions, at your pleasure.

Thank you, sir.

Mr. GRISET. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, and committee staff, and welcome to a familiar chamber. My name is Dan Griset, and I am pleased to participate in your hearing this morning on transportation in Orange County. Today I am speaking on behalf of the Orange County Transportation Commission.

The Orange County Transportation Commission believes that the most cost-effective way to preserve personal mobility in our county is to invest in a combination of multimodal improvements, including improvements as you have seen to the road network, transit system, and train service.

I would like to share our thoughts with you on those improvements to the road network that are of national significance. Those that specifically relate to the interstate, primary and urban programs.

You will be hearing more later this morning about our county's transit needs. First, on Federal aid interstate program. Interstate 5, locally known as the Santa Ana Freeway, is very important to our county's ability to keep people and goods moving to and from jobs and production facilities.

It is the single artery linking Los Angeles, Orange, and San Diego Counties. The Orange County portion was built in the middle and late 1950's to the rural and suburban design standards in vogue at that time. Few improvements have been made since the freeway was completed. We are now living with an outdated, substandard facility which cannot accommodate today's traffic, let alone that projected for the future.

The Santa Ana Freeway is a six-lane facility through most of Orange County. Widening to eight lanes is under way on a segment through San Clemente and the extreme south county. Contrasting sharply, I-5 has been expanded to eight lanes in our neighboring counties to the north and south, forcing all traffic through a six-lane Orange County bottleneck.

I-5 through Orange County is now beyond its design life of 20 years, with some segments reaching 25 years of age. The facility is deteriorating rapidly, and is in need of major reconstruction.

Deterioration is noticeable. Pavement is cracked, separated and buckled in some places, and sunk in others.

Routine maintenance and rehabilitation efforts will no longer suffice. Pavement engineers tell us that much of the Santa Ana Freeway should be reconstructed. Heavy commercial truck usage, presently comprising as much as 13 percent of the total traffic on some segments of I-5 and Orange County, has also contributed to the facility's deteriorated condition.

The future will undoubtedly place additional burdens upon this already outdated facility. In less than 4 years, traffic volumes will approach 200,000-plus vehicles per day over three-fourths of this six-lane facility.

This translates into levels of service E and F, which are known in the trade as stop-and-go driving conditions for more than 12 hours per day. The traditional peak hours will be spread over 6 to 7 hours, in both the morning and afternoon, with a brief interval midday.

In addition, the number of commercial trucks using the facility will increase dramatically, concommitant with the county's economic growth. The Orange County Transportation Commission believes that the reconstruction of Interstate 5 in Orange County is of national significance, and should receive a high priority.

However, in our judgment, the investment needed to reconstruct I-5 would be fruitless without plans to expand the facility to at least eight lanes, and make other system improvements.

We believe the Federal responsibility should be to preserve an interstate system that works. Reconstruction of the existing six-lane facility alone will simply serve to improve a multimillion-dollar parking lot.

Accordingly, our Commission supports a shift in the Federal highway program emphasis to accelerate completion of a redefined interstate system, and expand the Interstate 3-R program, to a 4-R program, including much-needed reconstruction.

With the increased emphasis on Interstate 4-R, we support a higher Federal participation rate of 90 percent. We believe the national priority, over the long term, should be to protect and preserve the Federal investment that has been made in our network of interstate highways.

Furthermore, we believe expansion of interstate facilities to eight lanes in major urban areas, where it can be justified, should be eligible for interstate 4-R funding. Special considerations should be given to funding additional lanes on interstate segments which connect with segments having more lanes, so that bottlenecks are minimized.

In addition, improvements to substandard freeway-to-freeway interchanges on the interstate system, and improvements to overcrossings and interchanges needed to make the interstate route function within the State and local road system, should be included within the definition of an interstate 4-R program.

Next, we would like to make comments on the Federal air urban program. The Federal interstate and primary systems do not stand alone, but are interwoven with a network of State highways and local arterial roads.

In urban areas such as Orange County, the Federal air urban program has been a major funding component for the transportation infrastructure. Because the FAU program is extremely flexible in its application, it has been highly responsive to local needs.

In Orange County, the Federal air urban program is about a $7 million-per-year program, funding a variety of projects, including signal interconnects, widenings, park-and-ride lots and transportation centers.

Although it is difficult to characterize any single FAU project as being in the national interest, and therefore deserving of Federal funding, we believe that on the whole, there is a continuing Federal role and responsibility in preserving and augmenting the urban transportation system.

Let me explain. The relationship between I-5 and the FAU system in Orange County cannot be overstated. Because I-5 severely congested the adjacent surface streets, many of which are on the FAU system, are overtaxed with traffic that would otherwise be using the freeway.

It is difficult to distinguish between Federal and non-Federal responsibilities in these circumstances. Because of this, we urge you to maintain a Federal urban transportation program.

We recognize, however, that a Federal urban transportation program may not be of the same importance as the interstate or primary programs. Consequently, the Orange County Transportation Commission would be willing to accept a reduction in the Federal participation rate from 75 to 50 percent.

We believe a lower Federal participation rate will stretch scarce resources and possibly result in more effective use of these funds. On the subject of Federal aid primary and your program: We want to comment briefly on this program.

Our Commission views the Federal system of primary highways as clearly a Federal responsibility, second only to the interstate system. We think the primary program works well, and should be continued without major change. Mr. Chairman, I hope that you will give these thoughts we have outlined here today careful consideration, as you and your colleagues in the Senate formulate a far-reaching, Federal highway legislative program.

I and the other of the Commission and staff would be happy to respond to any questions you may have.

Mr. **Anderson**. Well, thank you, Councilman Griset.

I have some questions. Mr. Roosevelt, you say that Orange County's economic survival is dependent upon the mobility of its residents. Do you believe this mobility is dependent upon Federal assistance in the form of both highway and transit assistance?

Mr. **Roosevelt**. Yes, sir, I do, because, as has been pointed out by some of the others, we are no longer just a bedroom community or series of communities for larger metropolitan areas.

People have to come to work now into Orange County and of course, get back from work. And we believe that if in order to make Orange County a viable growth pattern continue to exist, we really got to have ability for people to come and go.

Mr. **Anderson**. So then the very economic survival of the county would depend upon the Federal assistance to the highway program.

Mr. **Roosevelt**. Certainly has a very important role to play in it. Yes, sir.

Mr. **Anderson**. Supervisor Riley, in your statement, you outlined capital transportation needs for Orange County at over $2 billion, and that is all in 1980 dollars. Where do you envision this money coming from?

Mr. **Riley**. Well, I think it has been discussed by other speakers this morning, sir, that we need a combination of efforts, and I sincerely believe that the county is very serious in meeting its obligations in this regard.

Hopefully, I believe, sometime in the latter part of this year, we will have come up with a study which takes into consideration not only the roads that are needed very badly, but also certain capital projects, and how we will go into them. I personally envisioned bonding, bonds, perhaps even the toll road in the San Joaquin corridor. That is a personal favorite of mine. I think the public would accept that type of effort if it were clearly defined in the measures that only building of the activity would take place with the toll funds, but then that the maintenance and all would pick up there.

But certainly, with the kind of effort that we need, and also that the various witnesses have testified to you this morning, we certainly believe that there is a strong need for a combination effort.

Mr. ANDERSON. You recognize that we do need Federal dollars.

Mr. RILEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am trying to tighten this up a little bit because I think all of us are trying to cut our expenses in Washington and balance our budget, and so on.

But at the same time, I think we have to recognize that this one area of highway needs—I think that we have to point out to the administration this is one area where they should not cut. As a matter of fact, we feel it should be over in this trust fund and not mixed up with all these other things.

I suppose that is what I am trying to point out, to make it clear with everybody that even though you—and I am sure you are supporting the administration's plans for cutting our budget and our expenses, and even further cuts. That should not include our highway situation, particularly in this country.

Mr. RILEY. I certainly could not agree with you more. And I was interested in your comments about the industry in which it came back to you that you felt that this increase effort should relieve that responsibility somewhat.

Certainly Orange County has been very fortunate and it is attractive. A great deal of industry here would support the Nation's defense programs. It is the kind of industry here that I think we are very fortunate to have. But it has also brought into the county, as Jimmy Roosevelt and others have said, now a tremendous number of people who come here to work. It is just a matter that the Federal effort is absolutely essential to not only the well-being of the county itself, but I think also to these industries which are located here.

Mr. ANDERSON. Councilman Griset, you support increasing the Federal share for our program to 90 percent. The Senate-passed highway bill would maintain the present 75 percent match.

Could you elaborate on the need to increase the maximum to 90 percent—and I might let you know why—in our House bill, H.R. 3210, and I am the principal author on it, has passed. We do have 90 percent in there.

Mr. GRISET. Right.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senate, however, wants to hold it at 75 percent. You are advocating 90, and I would naturally like to hear you tell us why because it backs up our bill.

Mr. GRISET. Mr. Chairman, I think the comment I could make would be unrelated to any of the technical merits. I would relate simply if you are giving us the choice of supporting a 75 percent piece of legislation or a 90 percent, we like 90 better than 75 percent.

I think the specific merits I would like our executive director, Mr. Jenkins, to address.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, as you know, the existing interstate program is 90 percent. From my point of view, I think that was felt by Congress and the Nation that that was a major Federal investment and an appropriate share of Federal involvement in our national system of interstate and defense highways.

When we get to the rebuilding and maintaining that economic investment which was placed during the 1950's, 1960's, and 1970's, I do not see any reason why the Federal commitment related to important facilities should be decreased from that. It is obviously at a 90-percent level, making it a very high priority previously in the Federal Government to fund this program. And I think, from our point of view, that it is of primary importance to the national economy, both defense and commercial and other economic activities, and that it should be maintained.

That is, at least from the staff viewpoint, of why we have been behind the 90-percent program on the interstate for our program proposals.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Jenkins, do you see any role for HOV lanes in Orange County's future?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes, sir. As part of all of the existing freeway facilities in the county, and even the ones proposed, all of those are taking into consideration as part of the needed increase capacity is that high occupancy vehicle lanes would be a primary component for use of ride sharing, bus on freeway operations. In corridors where we have the potential for fixed guideways, like in the Santa Ana corridor, we are looking at that as the option.

But the high occupancy vehicle lanes right now, in order to encourage public transit usage, they have to mix with the same traffic flow as the single occupant automobile.

We have difficulty encouraging ride sharing because it, in general, increases the trip time from home to work. It may be less costly, but people still look at the time as a critical component of their travel. And without having the facilities to get more capacity out of that right-of-way, we cannot respond to that demand.

We look at that as a consideration in alternatives of looking at every one of the facilities.

Mr. ANDERSON. Now do you think that these HOV lanes that you favor—they are presently included in the interstate cost estimate—do you think they should be retained as we have done in the House-passed highway bill?

Mr. JENKINS. As part of what?

Mr. ANDERSON. As part of the interstate cost estimate, yes.

Mr. JENKINS. I haven't thought about it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I would like to have you answer that question. Do you think that HOV lanes presently included in the interstate cost estimate should be retained as we have done in the House-passed highway bill? It is in our bill; it is not in the other bill. There is a little question on that.

Mr. JENKINS. I have some difficulties in what is put in all types of highway needs bills and statements. We will respond specifically to that. But, I guess, my general concern is that when we look at needs, we look at them in different modal aspects rather than a multimodal solution to the corridor and other components.

I would like as a personal preference like us to look more toward what is our transportation needs in the future. I understand how the interstate cost estimate is used for distribution of funds, but we will respond to that question to your committee.

Mr. Anderson. If the Federal gasoline tax were increased, would you favor earmarking part of that increase for transit?

Mr. Jenkins. That is sort of a policy issue.

Mr. Anderson. Let me tell you there is always a question of where are we going to get money for transit. So one original suggestion was to maybe raise it 3 cents. Originally, raising it 2 cents would not be for transit.

And then there was a lot of opposition that said that you have got to have something for transit. Then they said two with an additional one for transit. And that didn't fly. Then the last we heard they were talking about maybe a 5-cent increase, of which 4 would be for highway and 1 for transit.

So these things are being kicked around, and I would like to hear you kick them around a bit, or someone here. If you don't want to do it, maybe one of the others would.

Mr. Jenkins. I could comment, and maybe some of the people who make the decisions. But from a standpoint of trying to put together programs, the aspect of having multimodal or funds which give us some flexibility in decisionmaking is important. When we are looking at alternative solutions to a corridor, we at times get locked into, well, this is the only fund source that there is available, and that prejudices our solutions. I am sorry to say that, but that is the way that things are done. We look at the financial aspects of that.

We have at both the State level—there has been, of course, the proposition 5 funds in the State of California which allows usage in nine counties of gas tax dollars for rapid transit or fixed guideway construction. Obviously right now that is done through a very difficult mechanism with the Federal Government and basically not allowed in the highway program except for interstate transfer if you have got something to shift.

I think we would have to look carefully as to if the proposals really provide the ultimate solution for the transit funding as well as the highway funding. Maybe some of my fellow commissioners——

Mr. Anderson. Would any other commissioners—I see Jimmy sort of jumping there.

Mr. Roosevelt. Mr. Chairman, I feel so strongly that—saying the presentation here that rapid transit is a part of your overall program wherever you really present it. It would seem fair to at least set a portion of whatever increase was being considered could now be included for rapid transit purposes.

I happen to believe that the use of rapid transit is so much greater as far as the total contribution it makes to the moving of people that it certainly should go forward as part of your overall plan. Therefore, why cut it out now when it would simply put it back and have it included in your presentation for almost the immediate future.

Mr. Griset. I think, Mr. Chairman, if there were provisions that would allow localities, say, an Orange County framework has some discretion in this area that it ends up perhaps being a more flexible piece of legislation than any particular type mandates, from the legislative point of view, as a county, we are going through an educational process, an analytical process of testing this concept of various modes within certain kinds of funding or economic parameters.

And the people in this county, I think, have an overwhelming preference for the automobile. Aside from the monorail at Disneyland, there is no practical experience in transit systems. But as we look at the future and the cost of road improvements and the like, we see a certain type of mix coming out as having the best cost effective potentials for movement of people and goods.

It is going to take time for us to bring along a package of changes. We have got the issue of local financing to come in with State and Federal financing for this thing to work at all.

To the extent that we are given that flexibility and the time develops in which are people can understand this process and support it with revenue measures that have to be voted on in rather stringent conditions here in California, I think we would probably prefer that approach with those kinds of local freedoms.

Mr. **Anderson**. All right. My next one is along the same line but it is probing a little deeper. If there was such a tax set-aside for transit, would you favor allowing such a transit set-aside to be used for operating and maintenance as well as capital?

These are things we have to vote on. We would like to hear your thoughts on them.

Mr. **Griset**. Well, I might make a brief comment. It may fall to following testimony with director Clark, director-supervisor Clark, in his testimony speaking for the transit district.

Mr. **Anderson**. He comes on in a few minutes.

Mr. **Griset**. I think he probably deserves most of the thunder in that area. I think it is clear that there is sometimes an oversimplification of operating expenses vis-a-vis certain kinds of capital issues in developing and maintaining the capital investment.

And we think consideration has got to be given to certain kinds of operational expenses and really protecting the investment there that is made in the system.

Mr. **Anderson**. What would you think about earmarking such a set-aside to the Federal aid urban system funds from which may be used funds for transit capital costs? It is kind of a little more of the same thing, or would you like to direct that question to Mr. Clark?

Mr. **Griset**. Mr. Clark or Mr. Jenkins probably could comment on that.

Mr. **Jenkins**. You are talking about with Federal aid urban as a——

Mr. **Anderson**. Yes. In other words, what would you think about earmarking such a set-aside to the Federal aid urban system funds from which may be used for transit capital costs?

Mr. **Jenkins**. Presently, we can use Federal aid urban funds for transit capital. My comment that the Federal aid urban funding program is one of them that I personally like because it does give us some options on how we can allocate those funds. We can look at them for both transit and/or highway facility needs.

I think, relating to Mr. Gresit's testimony, that is something that gives us some local flexibility on those funds. I think that mechanism has been very satisfactory to us in the county. And obviously

Best Available Copy

that $7 million a year, our current allocation out of that fund, would not go very far if we were looking at major transit capital investment.

If that is along your line, if you are talking rapid transit systems or something, then it would have to be a substantial increase in that fund, if there were new funds available.

Mr. **Anderson**. I have several other questions, but at this time I will go to Congressman Patterson, and then I will come back to myself and finish these.

Mr. **Patterson**. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to welcome all members of the panel again. I really only have one question. I guess I will ask each of you to comment if you would like to.

In the Senate bill there was an amendment adopted which permits right-of-way construction acquisition lane additions and overpass reconstruction as acceptable projects under the 4-R program.

In the House bill, while it does have the 4-R program, the additions are being added and it does not specify that in particular. I would like the panel to comment on whether or not you think it should be included in the House version and, if so, why?

Mr. **Roosevelt**. Well, Mr. Chairman, if I may start off, I think the Commission has already testified officially in favor of the Senate provisions. I don't think we have changed our minds any. The staff can go into it in more detail, I think.

Mr. **Patterson**. Well, how would it be specifically helpful in regard to the Santa Ana Freeway?

Mr. **Jenkins**. Thank you, Mr. Patterson.

The matter on the flexibility that is written into the program there has been some matters only related to the reconstruction of the physical facility and not looking at upgrading the interchanges and overcrossings, and some of the associated local traffic problems that ingress and egress to the Santa Ana Freeway.

There has been some real concern on discussions with the administration and other members of the committee staffs about what the money could be used for. And I think what we were looking for was making sure there is a better congressional definition as to the intent, or at least the flexibility of those funds; not just coming in under a 4-R which has just said we will reconstruct the physical lanes that are there, just rebuild that without consideration of some of the other aspects of the facility. And if it is obviously going to be widened, they would cause difficulties with the interchanges.

One of our problems with the freeways is getting over them, and also getting on and off of them in a satisfactory manner. Many of our local cities can testify to the difficulties of the interface with the systems. And it should just not be a Federal priority to just build a main line and not look at the associated consequences of that facility.

That is pretty much our reasoning behind that. I am not sure if it has to be in a bill or where it has to be.

It has to be said. I think we want to be sure that the Federal Highway Administration and the Department of Transportation have some flexibility in use of those funds.

Mr. **Patterson**. Not only you have mentioned that the House version would not preclude those items, but it doesn't specifically say those items are included as does the Senate version. So you would hope that liberal interpretation of the House bill would also permit rights-of-way acquisition, land additions and overpass reconstruction as well.

And I think, having had that stated, the bottleneck problem in this central area of Orange County is a key problem in terms of providing the kind of traffic thruway that is necessary. But I did want to get on record here with the subcommittee so that we might possibly get an amendment into the House version specifically authorized those items. It does now, but it does not preclude them.

Mr. **Jenkins**. Yes. There has been some difference of opinion with people working both in the administration and on some of the committees related to how that money would be spent.

Mr. **Patterson**. Sometimes it is helpful to have things nailed down in writing.

Mr. **Jenkins**. Yes.

Mr. **Patterson**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Anderson**. Thank you.

Mr. Jenkins, on the subject of either the elimination or the reduction of transit funds, one recent study indicated that a total elimination of transit operation assistance would result in an 11-percent drop in patronage, with four out of five of these trips then being switched to the automobile.

What would the impact of this be on your highway needs in Orange County?

Mr. **Jenkins**. I think, over the long term it will have a similar impact. As an example, on the Santa Ana corridor, as part of the solution, the rapid transit and other aspects, we expect up to 30 percent of the peak-hour travel to be carried in the public transit, fixed guideway, use of some of the commuter rail.

I guess it comes back to what it would show in my remarks that if we did it like we used to, we would be anywhere from 14 lanes on the——

Mr. **Anderson**. You are anticipating my next question then.

Mr. **Jenkins**. I am sorry.

Mr. **Anderson**. Would the need for additional highway dollars then offset the reduction in transit expenditures? Some of us feel that reducing the transit expenditures is going to put automobiles back on the highway that are not there now; and if we take care of the automobiles, it is going to cost us so much more money.

Mr. **Jenkins**. Well, I think from my commission's viewpoint, we feel the more cost-effective solution is the multimodal solution. As we have outlined in the Santa Ana corridor, is that we look toward facilities which can give us some higher capacity like a rapid transit corridor or even HOV lanes which would provide us much more carrying capability than one freeway lane.

I use an example at times of a freeway lane in its best operation might carry about 2,500 people per hour in that lane. Even a high-occupancy vehicle lane, depending on whom you talk to, can maybe carry 5,000 to 8,000 persons per hour. A rapid transit or even a medium capacity facility, the Chicagos or the higher ones, can carry up to 60,000 persons per hour in that basically the same amount of right-of-way that is required.

I think from the standpoint of looking at growth in the county, the 14 lanes we projected only goes to 1995. The county, as far as I can see, is not planning to stop growing at that point in time, at least the projections show us that. So we would just be ever increasing the highway system which is not a practical solution in the long term.

Mr. **Anderson**. You comment, I believe, on the Interstate 4-R. Recent reports from the Federal Highway Administration show that under current funding policies the interstate system is deteriorating at an accelerated rate. I mentioned that about a moment ago.

In 1975, 4 percent of the system needed rehabilitation. But that figure had grown to 9 percent by 1978, it almost doubled in roughly 3 years. Up to 2,000 miles in the Interstate System is reaching its design life each year.

Clearly these trends indicate that much more has to be done by the Federal Government, by the State and by the local governments to increase funding in this area. The level of Federal funding is currently $275 million a year. But we see a need to ultimately raise that level to over $2 billion a year.

Now I intend to do my part to see that California gets its fair share of these new dollars, this is 10 percent of what we normally think.

My question to you is: What assurance do you have from the State of California that the Santa Ana corridor will be a high priority?

Mr. **Jenkins**. I think at this point in time the Caltrans is a party to the study and the technical work we are doing. It is a four-party action with Caltrans, the Southern California Association of Governments, and the transit district and ourselves as far as specifically the Santa Ana corridor study. Caltrans will be doing the environmental impact statement work on the widening of the Santa Ana Freeway, other aspects of commuter rail and other busway options. They are doing that work for us.

Also the California Transportation Commission has recognized this corridor study as a major one and has funded parts of it in this year's transportation improvement program.

I think, from the standpoint of getting it recognized as a priority locally and at the State level, we are doing as much as we can in that area and we have all the parties at least on board through this phase of it.

Mr. **Riley**. Mr. Chairman, we do have a member from the Caltrans organization.

Mr. **Anderson**. I see him out there, and I am going to have him come up later on.

Mr. **Griset**. I think one indication of the county's concern and seriousness about being considered in the whole statewide transportation picture is described by the breakthrough in putting our own transportation district within the State here recently. We used to be a subsection of the L.A. district and we now have our own distinction of being district 12 within the old system.

While its administrative structure at this point, assuming we are able to enjoy some of the benefits of new State legislation raising the gas tax with the Foran bill, which I am sure you are acquainted, we think this administrative reality is going to grow as a practical reality in the life of the county and our being perceived within the whole State environment as an important factor in the statewide transportation improvement programs.

So we are getting a growing investment of business interests and political interests here that I think assures us of a good hearing and a good response in the State arena.

Mr. **Anderson**. I have one last question to direct to Mr. Jenkins, because it shows that we have different kinds of highway needs.

Earlier this year, the subcommittee held hearings over in Coachella Valley, over in the neighboring counties of Imperial and Riverside to discuss the problems associated with Highway 86. I want to compare the needs of Highway 86 in your mind with the needs of the Santa Ana Freeway, because they are just opposite. Highway 86 is one where it is not a case of congestion like the picture showed, but more of needing extra lanes due to dangerous shoulders and accidents. They showed us pictures where 30 or 40 schoolchildren were injured in a bus accident, and another where I think there were 4 or 5 children killed. And there was—I don't remember the numbers, but it was high, the number of people that have been killed just on that highway in the last year.

Of course, we have to look at all of these when we measure should we spend money in an area where there are lives being lost, or should we put money in an area where there are these tremendous congestions where sometimes you can hardly even move fast enough to get killed?

If you were in our position, how would you prioritize their highway needs against what your highway needs are?

I want to bring it up because I want you to be aware our needs are not always just congestion.

Mr. **Jenkins**. If we had all the gold, that would be an easy decision.

I might say that we have supported through the regional transportation improvement program the improvements throughout 86, collectively in the region. It is hard to imagine at times, but imperialists started part of the regional agency in Imperial County. We have supported it. Personally, I don't think we ever discussed this at the commission. But from the standpoint of it being an integral part of the farm-to-market facility, we are dependent on goods and services and supplies from all over the State, and why we feel that freight service and commodity movement is of importance. We have maybe a day's supply of food in the county in the warehouses. We are quite dependent on those.

Route 86 is on the Federal primary system. I think in our testimony we pressed both the importance of the interstate and the Federal aid primary system as being major components and of statewide and nationwide significance.

I would just hope that there is, I think, from a standpoint of safety—there has been some action taken on trying to improve the safety of the facility.

Mr. **Jenkins**. I would suppose that there is, I think from a standpoint of safety, you know, there has been some actions taken on trying to improve the safety of the facility. I think there is some questions about whether it ought to be a full freeway-type of operation, and we might have some questions on that. We are not necessarily part of the decisionmaking process, but I think there—you know, it is important from the standpoint of priorities.

I think it would be something from there that could be probably done sooner because of the less difficulty of implementation. Not that I would say it is any more important than the—you know, the commodity travel and freight movements on Interstate 5.

I think—and I would look at from that viewpoint of what is—what it is serving this region and the west coast. And I still would probably personally have to place my dollars on the Interstate 5 as of having more importance to the majority of the people in the State and in this region. I will probably lose my good friends in Imperial County with that statement, but—that is the way I would view it. It is not that it is not important, but if you ask, if you got down to having to make the decision.

Mr. **Anderson**. I was rather impressed when we held hearings down in Coachella to find that the city of Los Angeles had a city councilman down there, sent down there to testify on behalf of 86. I think it is good to know that these areas to work together, and we do recognize it.

Mr. **Jenkins**. And we have supported that, as far as the regional effort.

Mr. **Anderson**. Councilman Griset, would you favor or oppose the imposition of federally determined minimum standards and punishments on drunk driving with a failure to meet these minimums, resulting in loss of highway funds and things?

That is an issue that is developing in Washington today with a number of deaths on the highways as a result of drunk driving, and the fact that it seems to be getting worse all over the country.

Mr. **Griset**. Mr. Chairman, I can't give you a commission position on this. I could give you a personal view, and we would do a straw vote here for you real quick.

Mr. **Anderson**. I never had to worry about Jimmy Roosevelt not speaking up when he wanted to, because I am sure that the supervisor is the same way. If anyone wants to disagree with you or amplify it, they can.

Mr. **Griset**. I would agree in concept with the language you described there, as a penalty against drunk driving, and with those sanction powers, should a State not agree to adopt these standards as a State standard, we would suffer some loss in Federal support.

It would happen to be my personal view, as I understand the issue. This State, however, has a record of going its own way on certain matters, which would make compromise Federal funds coming into the State, and I think members of the commission would also hold some views on that.

We see that translating into impacts on Federal aid urban effort, which in localities like mine and Santa Ana threatens to impair major facility improvement on First Street, for example, with these kinds of sanctions falling due.

But in general principle, my personal view would be to support that kind of effort, simply because of its importance and taking drunk drivers off the streets.

Mr. **Riley**. I would very strongly support that.

Mr. ANDERSON. A group of us in Congress—have asked the President to appoint a blue-ribbon commission to do a nationwide study on this, and report to us, and at the same time, to contact the Governors to have them do it State by State, and in also the larger metropolitan areas, the mayors are doing the same thing, because we think it is something we have to take a good look at one of these days.

Anything further, Jerry?

Mr. PATTERSON. No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am going to recess the hearing for about 3 minutes. And we will come right back, and we will pick up with Supervisor Clark and the rest of the witnesses before we go to lunch. So we shall move as fast as we can.

We will stand in recess for about 3 minutes.

[Recess.]

Mr. ANDERSON. The meeting of the subcommittee will come to order.

Our next witness is on the transit connection, the Honorable Ralph B. Clark, chairman of the Orange County Board of Supervisors.

TESTIMONY OF RALPH B. CLARK, CHAIRMAN, ORANGE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Mr. CLARK. Very well. Good morning, Mr. Chairman. I am Ralph Clark, chairman of the board of supervisors of Orange County, but also I serve as chairman of the Orange County Transit District, and a member of the Orange County Transportation Commission, and I say that because that has a significant effect upon the remarks that I have that I am representing all of those three areas in my comments.

You have heard generally about Orange County's transportation needs. Now I would like to discuss a little about our public transit needs.

Since a primary transportation problem is projected over utilization of our freeway and arterial highway system, public transit takes on a unique character in Orange County, different from other urbanizing areas. Here, we are talking about a region which is built around the love affair with the automobile, but which is choking on that mode of travel.

True, we have a significant transit-dependent population, despite our affluent image. But to maintain a public transit system capable of carrying these often low-income workers to the many jobs available to them in Orange County, we must broaden our market, we must appeal to the persons who can make a choice between riding public transit and driving their usually single occupant automobile.

Transit's job in the multimodal transportation plan for Orange County is to provide an attractive alternative to the private auto, so that those drivers who must have their private vehicle, will find space on the roads.

There is another reason to develop a rapid transit system in Orange County. One of our major problems is the tilt towards high-cost housing and the poor availability of lower cost housing.

Orange County businesses rank our housing problem as a chief deterrent to attracting workers.

To find affordable housing, many employees are now living in neighboring San Bernardino and Riverside Counties, and spend many unproductive hours commuting to their Orange County jobs.

Prospective employees balk at this kind of lifestyle. If we match up our housing problem with the fixed-guideway rapid transit system in this central area of the county, we think we have the start of a solution to both the mobility problem and the housing problem.

We know the communities tend to organize themselves around their transportation systems. Roads or fixed transit—you notice that I did say fixed-route bus route—fixed route, rather than regular bus routes, because they are just not permanent enough to cause investors to make land use decisions based on the locations of bus routes.

But they will take advantage of a guideway system. If we can get city planners and developers of the residential properties to work together to provide increased housing densities in the more urbanized areas of our county close to the rapid transit system, housing costs could be cut down and travel patterns for people going to work could be shortened and concentrated.

So, a fixed guideway rapid transit starter line could be a very important catalyst which would ensure a healthy future for Orange County.

In 1972, public transportation in Orange County was virtually nonexistent. Over the past 9 years, we built an organization, the Orange County Transit District, which operates a fleet of 497 large and 102 small buses, provides fixed route and community-level, demand-responsive services in every community in the county, and which nows carries over 30 million passengers per year.

The success of these programs has been due to the concerted efforts of local elected officials in Orange County, as well as from the assistance of regional, State, and Federal agencies which invested in OCTD's public transportation program.

Yet, the bus system, as it currently stands, and is expected to grow, will not be able to carry the full public transit load. Medium capacity rail is likely to be needed in the future if we are to meet the travel demands. Orange County needs a balanced transportation system.

In meantime, Federal budget cuts are forcing us to delay our bus expansion plans, as we are performing another kind of balancing act, balancing fare increases, service curtailment, and good management practices to provide the most service that we can with the resources available.

We hope we won't need to keep our belts so tight for very long. We hope the President's economic plan succeeds, and that Federal funding for both capital and operating expenditures will return. So we are carefully adjusting to the present, while planning for the future. We must keep our bus service operating, and even growing a little over the coming 10 years.

But we must also have the starter line of a rapid transit system built and operating by 1989. We have inventoried our financial resources, made some assumptions about the future, and laid out a 10-year projection for both.

First, the bus system assumptions of our 10-year outlook are: We will maintain our present fares, 75 cents during the peak, and 60 cents during the off-peak until 1984. Thereafter, the fares will increase annually, based on the inflation experienced 2 years earlier.

Inflation will increase from 7.12 percent to 7.72 percent per year. Now this is from the UCLA economists who give this projection. The State's Transportation Development Act, local transportation fund will increase in Orange County by 14.7 percent per year. Historically, this has been the case.

OCTD's fixed-route bus service will increase by 3 percent of our vehicle service hours annually. Community demand-responsive service will level off at about 54 percent of the current service by 1985.

Federal operating assistance could be unavailable beginning in 1985. State transit assistance funds could be unavailable beginning in 1983. If these assumptions prove to be right, we project that we can maintain bus service for the 10-year period under these conditions and realize a farebox revenue ratio of 26 percent of the operating costs.

This level of bus service will be far from ideal for Orange County, but it will be adequate. If Federal maintenance funds of, say, 10 to 25 percent of our bus operating costs—and we operate a fleet of 497 large and 100 and—excuse me. It would become available, we will have more Transportation Development Act money to apply to our rapid transit development program.

Now, as for the financial outlook for rapid transit, here are—this picture is not very rosy. We have planned ahead, and saved some money, so we would be able to have $120 million to apply to our project that could cost $900 million in escalated dollars by the time it is completed in 1989.

Although we are maximizing the State and Federal funds currently available to us, we have identified an additional funding requirement of over $600 million for rapid transit starter line.

How do we plan to secure funding for a rapid transit system? We certainly expect to pursue Federal funding, but Reagan policy is proposing an indefinite delay for new starts. We are currently exploring alternative scenarios, including local financing options.

This includes seeking joint funding of some facilities with the business community. We are exploring all possible creative financing options, including the depreciation tax writeoff, and a leaseback authorization recently passed by Congress.

But, we need from you gentlemen an assurance that the Federal Government will not abandon its investment in public transit in the Nation. Federal funding has paid for a substantial number of the buses in our fleet; for our administration and operating facilities.

We believe that the concept of Federal contribution to the continued maintenance of our transit system equates to a prudent investment in the Nation's economy. We believe that transportation, roads, and transit, is an integral part of the Orange County economy.

What do we need as a minimum? We work with our neighboring transit operations in our urbanized area, and with the American Public Transit Association. We have assisted in providing data, proving that the productivity of the Nation's public transit system has improved under the Federal financing programs of the seventies.

I refer you to the APTA testimony of October 21, 1981, before the Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation. The members of the American Public Transit Association represent a broad spectrum of transit operators. Building a consensus for a Federal program that will continue to meet their basic needs has been an exercise in statesmanship.

The results of months of negotiations and compromise among APTA members was presented to the APTA legislative committee last Thursday, November 19, and we support these recommendations.

Recognizing the need to limit Federal assistance to local operators, APTA has concluded that a block grant program, splitting the funding available to bus and rail operators, would avoid pitting bus operators against bus-rail operators.

APTA also feels that a discretionary program for rail construction and bus acquisition is essential to the future transportation needs of the Nation. APTA concurs with the concept of a block grant program which would allow a local discretion of how the Federal funds are used. It is emphatic, however, that the existing designated recipient mechanism be retained to assure necessary local autonomy.

These are the components of the APTA recommendations for fiscal year 1983 budget. First, the Federal-local share for capital assistance should be set at 80 percent Federal, 20 percent local for the formula program, and 70 percent Federal, 30 percent local for the discretionary programs.

Second, the minimum program levels for fiscal year 1983 should be $3.7 billion. Third, for the bus program, Federal funds should be allocated on a formula of 50 percent population, population density, and 50 percent bus revenue vehicle miles.

Recognizing the desire of Congress to reduce dependency on local transit operators on Federal operating assistance, APTA proposes to establish a maximum percentage of a local operator's budget which could come from the Federal Government.

This cap is proposed to be 25 percent. For operators currently exceeding this amount, this 25-percent goal should be reached in two steps.

To summarize, Orange County has the potential for a very successful rapid transit guideway project, a project that could have a very positive influence on the economy of the county. We have the institutional arrangements, the business community support, the technical staff and studies to bring this project to fruition.

We do lack sufficient dollars. We believe the Federal contributions to our project make good national sense. In terms of protecting the Federal dollars already invested here and in terms of maintaining a sound local economy which will continue to be a healthy influence on the Nation's economy.

We can wait a few years for the current administration to work on the inflation problem and try to balance the budget. But we can't wait too long or our economy will surely suffer. We are willing to make a substantial local effort to finance our system, when we feel it is only fair that Federal dollars come back to Orange County to make this very important project possible.

We think this kind of Federal investment should be a continuing national policy.

Thank you.

Mr. ANDERSON. Thank you, Ralph, for an excellent statement. I have a couple of questions.

Last year, Los Angeles County voters approved proposition A, increasing the sales tax by half a penny. With these additional revenues going for transit, Los Angeles County Transportation Commission helps spearhead that effort.

Given the very great transit needs which you have outlined here, do you believe that Orange County voters would approve a similar tax increase to reduce their dependence for Federal—transit capital from the Federal Government?

Mr. CLARK. I will have to answer that in two ways. First of all, you know we are laboring and operating with tax funds in Orange County under proposition 13. The interpretation of whether it requires a two-thirds vote for this proposition that passed Los Angeles, to be passed in Orange County, is still being determined by the Supreme Court, if I am not mistaken.

There should be a decision forthwith on this. If it comes out that it is 66⅔, Los Angeles does not get any money over what they pass. I think they pass about 52, 53 percent, if I am not mistaken.

And now I will answer for Orange County. I don't think that any taxing measure that requires 66⅔ percent, would pass in Orange County. As a matter of effect, I don't know any of the 56 counties in this State—or 58 counties, excuse me—that could possibly pass one.

However, there is no doubt in my mind that a simple majority would pass in Orange County. I am sure of that, you heard the great support that we have from our business community that was before you this morning, speaking, I think, that this is unprecedented where you can have representatives of such great industries all banding together to support Government.

It is a very close relationship between government and the free enterprise system that we do enjoy here in Orange County. And I think with their support, that we very definitely could pass a prop A in Orange County on a 50-percent basis.

Mr. ANDERSON. Supervisor Clark, as you know, as transit fares increase patronages decline. Chicago, St. Louis, and Boston all raised their fares, and saw their riderships decline by 5, 17, and 8 percent, respectively. If Federal operating assistance were greatly reduced, or eliminated, how would that impact upon your fare structure?

Mr. CLARK. Well, naturally, we are not going to be able to escape the formula or the trend that you are speaking of. We recently had a fare increase in there and we realized a minimal effect on it on the dropoff, and then since then we have resumed our scale and continually going upward in our figures that we are carrying.

We are carrying more people now, for example, than we were before the price fare. So I think that this all sifts out. There are so many things that go into this, and it hasn't even been mentioned this morning, when you are talking about public transportation, you are talking about relieving congestion, you are talking about the person that can't afford the gasoline to put into his automobile, you are talking about the air pollution problem that is caused from the congestion of all of these automobiles belching this out on the freeway.

You are talking about the fact that these are things that have to be put into the mix when you are talking about widening the highways, and also talking about new corridors and so forth. You have got to tie public transportation and these high-occupancy vehicle lanes into any type of structure where there is going to be highway money. In my mind. You have to give people an alternative to the automobile. And if you don't have the convenient alternative, you are going to be having problems.

And so, consequently, whatever funds come in transit, it is going to complement the highway funds. So, I think that when you are—understand, and I know you do, Mr. Anderson, and Mr. Patterson certainly does—about the air pollution problems that we do have in Orange County. Public transit and high-occupancy vehicle lanes and ride-sharing programs are an intelligent way of approaching that.

And, of course, the scientific way, improving the catalytic converter, and all of these items and fuel, certainly helps. But public transportation is a very important item in these other areas.

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, on that Federal operating assistance program, currently run about $1.1 billion. Should this be continued, or eliminated as is being recommended?

Mr. CLARK. Well, I think that the funds should not be eliminated. I think that probably there should be some kind of consideration for the local autonomy to be able to use funds more at their discretion. We are the people, remember, that are close to the people at home. We have to answer their problems.

If there is a fire, they don't call Washington or Sacramento, they call the local fire department. If they got people bunched up on the corner, they don't call Caltrans up there, they call their local elected official in that city or that county or whatever it is.

So, my point is whatever funds that become available, I would like to see a policy that more leans toward the local discretion of the elected officials in that particular area to use their judgment on the disbursing of those funds.

Mr. ANDERSON. You haven't been reading our mail. We do get calls.

Mr. CLARK. I understand. I didn't mean that you didn't get any, but I tell you, you at least are back there. We are right here where they get on top of you.

Mr. ANDERSON. And you know, just to deviate a bit from a very serious thing, and maybe lighten it, people don't realize the difference is sometimes we are called upon. I represent Catalina Island, I have the city of Avalon.

And this doesn't have to go for the record, because it is really not related. But they haven't any water over there. The only water they get is rain. And yet they need to put out fires, and so they use the salt water putting out fires in the city.

They have two big pumps. One pump is to operate, the other one is a reserve. They were having the one big pump over here in the mainland repaired, since the other one was on. While it was on, it went out. So here was the whole city without any water for any fire, which is a catastrophe.

Well, they did call Washington. They called us, they called me. Within 45 minutes, we had Navy helicopters taking an extra pump out there to set them in place. So they do call us for a fire, I want you to know that.

I am not suggesting that you do that, but sometimes we get the most unusual kind of things, and Jerry kind can give you a string of these, too. But we are not as close as you are. I was the mayor once. And I know you are very close there.

Mr. CLARK. Well, I also know that you get a lot of mail on problems that you certainly cooperate with those——

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, I thought that was a pretty good record, within 45 minutes to have a helicopter with a pump on its way. That is better than Jerry could do.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, I was going to say that you have had experience at the local level as mayor of Hawthorne, and at the State level, and now at the Federal level, and I don't think he has ever moved very far from Long Beach, in the sense that he probably spends a third of his time there. And he spends full time in Washington, D.C., and a third of his time—that is 33 percent—and I don't know how he does it, other than riding the redeye.

Mr. ANDERSON. You gave me an opening. I am going to warn you about something. I started off in Hawthorne as mayor, and the legislature, Redondo Beach. My original congressional district was Redondo Beach and Hawthorne. Every time they reapportion, I move closer to Orange County, and this year, they bring me up, giving me Lakewood and Cerritos, so I come to the Orange County line. I am almost—I am not part of you yet, but I am getting awful close.

Mr. PATTERSON. As soon as there is enough room for another Democrat, we will——

Mr. CLARK. Well, I also know that Representative Patterson was a mayor. In fact, we both served together in the League of Cities, so I can tell you that I know that you folks do understand what I am talking about.

In other words, right here is where the actual needs are right in front of us at all times, and we are not—although we sympathize with the national problems, it is not part of our policy to settle those. And we have to be right on top of this.

So who closer to the actual problem could address it than the local people? And I think you would agree from your past positions as mayors.

Mr. ANDERSON. Ralph, a little on the budget here. As you know, the administration has proposed additional cuts in the transit budget for fiscal year 1982, that is the year coming up.

How would you make these cuts, assuming you had no other option. Would you make the cuts across the board, or would you vary the cuts? Would you cut them more from capital or operating? How would you do it if you had to do it?

Mr. **Clark**. Well, if I had to do it, I would look very carefully at the plans and the programs to which we have been committed, and the necessity of either continuing them or there is a new program that is on the line that needs this particular start right now. Like you said, there is a crack in the highway, and you don't fix it, well, you are going to have to spend 50 times that amount in another year to go back to where you are.

In other words, I think—this can't give you an answer to that straight across the board. Everything has to be looked at. But if I was back there, and I had to balance a budget, I will tell you where I would begin, that is cut down on some of this foreign aid, and a few other things, and keep some of our money right here in our own country, instead of sending it all around the world.

Mr. **Anderson**. Along the same related approach, on block grants, now you have made reference in your statement to ideas which have been circulating to convert the transit assistance program to a block grant. How appealing do you find this idea?

Mr. **Clark**. I beg your pardon? I didn't quite get the question.

Mr. **Anderson**. Well, there has been some suggestion that we convert the transit assistance program to a block grant program. In other words, let the people—give them maybe not as much money as they got before, cut it down, and let you make the decision of how you want—would apportion the less money than you had before.

That is, in a sense, what the block grant is. How appealing would you find this if we had to do it that way?

Mr. **Clark**. If the block grant was based upon the needs, somehow or other something has—there has to be a formula that addresses this. As discussed earlier, Orange County is tired of being a donor county here. We have some of those—you have heard, some of the most distressing needs that you ever saw. So, as a consequence, there is only so much money available, as long as there is a fair share of it directed toward Orange County and a fair share to evaluate their needs against other needs around the county.

I have no problem about seeing that our Orange County tax dollars are used elsewhere, if we don't have needs that are higher in priority than where our dollar is going. If we have these needs, like if you wait in line to turn onto the Newport Freeway off of the Santa Ana to try to catch an airplane, at the airport, at a certain time, you don't allow yourself an extra hour during rush time, boy, you are in problems.

We have got big needs here in the county.

Mr. **Anderson**. If that is a critical problem, Jerry has probably got that on my route home.

Mr. **Clark**. Addressing the fact that you are talking about funds coming here. We are talking about an hourglass configuration of Orange County, eight lanes coming down from Los Angeles and coming into six lanes, and then out toward San Diego, back into eight lanes.

In other words, it is your moving all this into a 10-pound bag, and believe me, it bursts. And if you look at the number of accidents on the Santa Ana Freeway, you will see that a large percentage of them, and I don't want to be quoted, because I don't know the exact figure, but someone on the staff can give you the number of accidents that occurred in the middle of this hourglass, right in the Orange County area, compared to the rest of the Santa Ana Freeway.

Mr. **Anderson**. Well, being a little more specific on my question, currently, about 60 percent of Federal transit assistance is made available as a discretionary grant, while 40 percent is apportioned by formula. Would it be more practicable to radically alter these proportions, for example, to distribute, say, 90 percent on the basis of formula, and 10 percent at the Secretary's discretion

Mr. **Clark**. I would say that whatever formula would be practical, and I am not in the position to give you an answer on your formula structures that are back there. I would like to evaluate it and see the bottom line for the money that comes to Orange County and addresses our needs.

Mr. **Anderson**. Ralph, if any one of these questions are too technical, we will keep the record open and if you amplify you can. In other words, we are not—you can correct this, or you can send us additional information.

Mr. **Clark**. Thank you very much.

Mr. **Anderson**. The purpose of these hearings is to collect information. We were in Boston just a couple of weeks ago. We are trying to get things from different parts of the country. Then we will put them together in our report. There will be different members at different times, put it in the report that will go to all members of the Transportation Committee, and to any Members of Congress that want to see them, and then we work from there.

So, we are not trying to limit anyone, we are trying to compile information.

Mr. **Clark**. Well, I and my staff will closely analyze the question and send you a written answer.

Mr. **Anderson**. On new starts and extensions. I was wondering if you would care to comment on the administration's policy of deferring funding for new starts and extensions during periods of economic uncertainty. In other words, is it your view that the Federal Government ought not be making these investments until the economy improves.

I think your remarks were, in a sense, just a little opposite that a little while ago, but I wanted to zero in on it a little bit more.

Mr. **Clark**. As I indicated, everything should be evaluated upon its need. In other words, perpetrating a pass-approved plan in opposition to a new start, which has been caused because maybe the old plan is not going to address the needs, then very well the new start would hold priority.

And that somewhere or other there has to be an analysis procedure that is going to indicate which is going to give the best value for the transportation dollar, and again, this is why I refer to the fact that the local autonomy here, in order to make decisions like this.

Mr. **Anderson**. Something along your same remarks a moment ago, I think I know your answer, Atlanta, Houston, Washington, D.C., Detroit, and Los Angeles all have transit capital requests in Washington, which face an uncertain future. They have been working now for several years in getting a shot at Federal funding.

Now, do you believe that it is realistic now when funds are short, to try to put Orange County at the top of the list, or should perhaps funding be set at a level to fund other worthy projects as well as Orange County. How would you do this in the framework of the fact that you have those five, six, five cities that I mentioned there.

I have been working on it for some time, some of the requests have even been turned down with—at the time when we didn't have—when we had more funding than we have today. Now we are finding a tightening of funding, and now Orange County is coming in, and rightfully so. How would you, in a sense, prioritize or measure these things?

Mr. **Clark**. Certainly, their needs should be addressed. And any prior commitments should be honored to the degree that it is logical. However, when you have a county that has grown like we have, out all of the counties in the country now, we are the sixth largest county.

In other words, a couple decades ago, all we were were an agricultural county, and all we had to worry about was getting avocados and oranges and beans to the market. But now, with the Santa Ana Freeway coming through here, we developed to where you have the second largest county in the State of California that is here.

It has big needs that are bunching in on top of this automobile-oriented society that we built in here. So, somehow or other, there has to be funds to address these needs. So consequently, I think that in the terms of the tax dollars that are being sent in that subsidize these programs throughout the country, that again, that the needs should be assessed, and if we come down to the fact that our needs should be addressed of others there, very well, we want to participate, and I would not argue about rearranging priorities at that particular time.

But I do believe that if you take some of the systems that you referred to, it is their fault that they have not progressed anywhere along there. Certain areas fight against this other area. There is not any type of cooperation throughout the entire county. There is different geographical areas and different business interests that are battling transit interests and downtown interests and so forth.

Whereas, in Orange County, you saw today, the chamber of commerce, and the head of one of the biggest companies in Orange County, representing all the other big companies in Orange County that have pledged the cooperation to work with us.

So you have all 26 cities and the county itself that joins in with this cooperation. So what I am trying to say, we will get something off the ground, if we are afforded the opportunity.

Mr. **Anderson**. You don't have to tell me about the growth here in Orange County, I am aware of it. I remember when I was a regent at the University of California, we were looking for places where land was cheap, and when we expanded the system from three to seven, and we came down to Orange County and looked at the site here because it was the only place in the State where there was a lot of free—not free, but a lot of land that was available to build the university.

So I am aware that when there weren't many people living out here and the tremendous job you people have done, and I want to congratulate anyone in public life who has had to put up with this tremendous growth problem that you people have had, it has just been phenomenal.

Something about refurbished buses. Long Beach Transit is a very important provider of public transit in my district, and they are delighted—and I am most impressed with the use they are making of rehabilitated used buses. Does the OCTD refurbish and reuse old rolling stock?

Mr. CLARK. Yes, we get every possible available mile that we can. As a matter of fact, years ago, we bought some old Dallas used buses that they had run through their life expectancy. And some of those are still running in our system, in our county, that we have had maintained and kept going.

Some of them are just beyond repair. But, basically, we do see that they are serviced regularly, and that they do get the maximum amount of usage out of them.

Mr. ANDERSON. What kind of a transit system do you think can make the best use, let's say, of rebuilt buses?

Mr. CLARK. Well, wherever the dollar value can be determined. In other words, if you are going to spend money on refurbishing a bus, and after you refurbish it, it is like painting an old building, you know, it has still got the old studs in it, and it has got the old rusty nails and everything else in it.

Whether or not it is economically feasible to be doing this when a new bus would cost *x* number of dollars more than the cost of the refurbishing. It is just good business sense that has to be exercised and wherever possible, you want to get the most out of the piece of equipment that you possibly can. I have no argument with that.

Mr. ANDERSON. One little dilemma on operating subsidy phaseout and the elderly and handicapped transportation, how they conflict. The administration has expressed an intention to eliminate Federal assistance for mass transit operating subsidies by 1985.

And yet, there are many provisions of Federal law which involve extra expense, such as the requirements to provide transportation services to elderly and handicapped persons, which Federal law imposes on local transit agencies, and which can be very costly.

And I was wondering if you see these as irreconcilable statements of policy?

Mr. CLARK. I think that they are. I think that they definitely are opposed to one another. The fact that you require all of these retrofits and so forth on the piece of equipment that makes its costs astronomically rise, and then tell us also to cut back in cost—that the two just don't balance out. And that somewhere or other there is going to have to be communications between the people that are making these ridiculous rules with the people that have to use this equipment in a system where they have to balance their budgets.

In other words, again, a lot of times they have to realize the fact that the persons in charge with the administration and the operation of a system probably know quite a bit more about it than the guy that has got a pencil and paper, looking at the fact, "Well, I get a request that on this bus that there is going to be a need for handicapped people, or there is going to need this type of retrofit on the engine, which cuts the fuel economy 50 percent, for example, that is on it."

And not being able to somehow or other reconcile this with people that are in the business themselves. So I think you need better communication in those areas.

Mr. **Anderson**. Supervisor, if Federal—and this results from the question I asked a moment ago to the panel, and they said ask Supervisor Clark when he gets on.

Mr. **Clark**. Those guys are always ahead.

Mr. **Anderson**. If the Federal gasoline tax is increased, do you feel that some of that increase should go to transit?

Mr. **Clark**. Evidently, I just couldn't say anything else but a resounding yes.

Mr. **Anderson**. Now, do you think that this new transit money should be distributed by the Federal Government to local governments on a discretionary basis, or by formula, perhaps that is the FAU funds?

Mr. **Clark**. Well, it all depends, again, what the formula would be. I have no problem with FAU. I think it is a good program.

Mr. **Anderson**. FAU eliminated only the capital.

Mr. **Clark**. It gives us discretionary use to some degree, which I have been talking about right along. But, however, as long as it is not given to the State—and that is the State distributed. That is a big problem with me. Because if it does, it is not going to get it to Orange County. We have never got a fair shuffle out of State funds yet, and I don't anticipate ever getting any.

Mr. **Anderson**. Should any of this new transit money be used for operating and maintenance, or only for capital purposes?

Mr. **Clark**. I think it should be used in all areas—operating, maintenance, and capital. In other words, again, to the discretion of the operator.

Mr. **Anderson**. Jerry?

Mr. **Patterson**. I think you responded very well to most of the questions. Ralph Clark, good to have you here. You used to mayor of Anaheim, I guess, when I was mayor of Santa Ana, and your testimony, I note, indicates that prior to 1972 there was virtually no public transportation system in the county.

Mr. Chairman, if there is ever the father of transportation questions and answers, we are looking at him here in Supervisor Clark. When I was on the council here in Santa Ana, we purchased a private bus company and then we didn't know what to do with it. This helped formulate the Orange County Transit District, and eventually took that over as the core of what is today OCTD. And I am sure the city of Santa Ana was pleased to be able to get rid of the burden of the financing of the bus system, and many thought it wouldn't work, and yet today I think you are as proud as I am of the fact that we have a very good, very fine public transportation system in the form of a bus system.

And I commend you on that, as really the father of the transit district. The testimony—in your testimony, you indicated a need, obviously for a balanced system, which I share with you completely, even though the hearing today largely concentrates on the private automobile. Buses use the Santa Ana Freeway as well, and I am sure that any kind of improvement of the Santa Ana Freeway would improve the overall transportation problem, and assist in balancing it. I assume that you would agree with that and are supporting this legislation, correct?

You testified on a fixed guideway rapid transit system. We have been searching for ways to do that. It is fairly expensive, as you know. And your testimony indicated that—well, I don't have it in front of me right where it was, but that the fixed route was necessary in order to support the kind of land use decisions——

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. PATTERSON [continuing]. Density, and that sort of thing. And I guess that is a two-edged sword in a way. Some of the people may not want it yet—you have got to have a great increase in density. Where do you see the fixed guideway, along the Santa Ana corridor?

Mr. CLARK. Yes, very definitely. In fact, it was testified by Mr. Kremer earlier about the number of people that are in this corridor, this blob that you saw on the map through here—the need for ready access to public transportation. I think 70 percent of the jobs in Orange County were located in this blob of 3 miles on either side.

So it is realistic conclusions that indicate the fact that this would be the spine or the cord, central cord, of whatever transportation or rapid transit system is put in there.

Now, people—and I am talking about the developers—the cities, planners, and so forth, are not going to be interested in a movable bus route, one that could be changed, you know, at the whim or needs or if anything developed later down the line—in other words, if something is put down, like the BART railroad was put down—in other words, I was talking to San Francisco representative of the transit district up there at a recent meeting. And he indicated the fact that this is happening right along the BART corridor, where they have put the BART in now, that they are developing high density, that—for the people that have to get to work, and so forth.

And like the business people indicated this morning, we can supply housing for all the chiefs that have to work in Orange County, but we have got to get Indians, or you are not going to be able to handle a balanced economy. And, consequently, these Indians have to live somewhere, and you have got to build a lot of teepees and so on. Probably have to do it along this transportation corridor, with the cooperation of the cities.

Mr. PATTERSON. Well, the increased—once the decision of fixed guideway would be made, it would tremendously increase the values of the properties adjacent to that. Have you any thoughts or considered what role private enterprise, particularly adjacent land owners might play in terms of financing such a system?

Mr. CLARK. Yes. I feel that these are things that can be developed as we progress in this line of thought. And this is why I indicated that the city planners—remember, that the transit district just can't go in and impose this—we don't make it the policy, even if our enabling legislation would say that we could do it.

We want to work in corporation, so whatever happens is going to be successful afterwards. And this is evidenced by our citizen advisory committee that we do have already. Every time that there is even route changes, or new methods that we are going to be involved in, we make sure that there is presentations to all of the different organizations and so forth that are being affected.

So we try to work very closely with the people. So private enterprise and the city, and the transit district, and the transit commission would all be represented and working together, so whatever plan was developed will be logical, and it would be one that addresses the needs and protects everyone that is involved.

Mr. PATTERSON. Well, I thank you, Supervisor Clark.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ANDERSON. Larry?

Mr. REIDA. No questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ANDERSON. Thank you very much, Ralph.

Mr. CLARK. Thank you very much.

Mr. ANDERSON. Our next witnesses: A. J. Wilson, Santa Ana city manager; and Bob Luxembourger, Santa Ana vice mayor.

Mr. Wilson, the full text of your prepared statement will be placed in the record at this point.

[Statement referred to follows:]

STATEMENT BY A. J. WILSON, CITY MANAGER, CITY OF SANTA ANA
FOR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION SUB-COMMITTEE
OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 23, 1981

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE FEDERAL AID URBAN SYSTEM TO THE INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

AS YOU HAVE HEARD THROUGHOUT THE HEARING TODAY, THERE IS TREMENDOUS PRESSURE BEING PLACED UPON THE SANTA ANA FREEWAY CORRIDOR TO HANDLE THE AMOUNTS OF TRAFFIC THAT ARE BEING GENERATED BY THE TREMENDOUS GROWTH OF ORANGE COUNTY. HOWEVER, WE, IN THE CITY OF SANTA ANA, WOULD ALSO LIKE TO POINT OUT TO YOU THE VITAL INTERCONNECTION OF THE URBAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS THAT WE MUST PROVIDE IN ORDER TO MAKE THIS CORRIDOR FUNCTION PROPERLY.

AS ONE VIEWS THE GROWTH OF TRANSPORTATION IN ORANGE COUNTY, IT SHOULD BE CLEAR THAT 90% OF THE TRAVEL ACTUALLY OCCURS ON THE ARTERIAL STREETS OF THIS COUNTY AND TO THE EXTENT THAT SANTA ANA LIES RIGHT IN THE CENTER OF THE COUNTY, ITS REQUIREMENTS TO PROVIDE THE PROPER FREEWAY INTERFACE WITH ITS LOCAL STREET SYSTEMS IS IMPERATIVE.

IN ORDER TO PROVIDE THE PROPER FREEWAY INTERFACE IN THE FUTURE, EVERY INTERCHANGE IN THE SANTA ANA CORRIDOR WILL HAVE TO BE REDONE. IN ADDITION, THE MAJOR FAU ROADWAYS THAT HAVE BEEN DESIGNATED IN THE PAST BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ACTUALLY ARE THE MAJOR FEEDING POINTS TO THIS FREEWAY CORRIDOR. WHERE ONE REALLY SEES THE BREAKDOWN IN CONGESTION IS ON THESE LOCAL ARTERIALS.

Best Available Copy

THERE IS ALSO THE VITAL INTERFACE OF THE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM. AS YOU HAVE HEARD FROM THE STUDIES THAT HAVE BEEN DONE, EXPANSION OF INTERSTATE 5 MUST OCCUR AND STILL THERE WERE PLANS FOR EXPANDING PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION IF WE ARE TO MEET THE TRANSPORTATION NEEDS OF THE NEXT TWO DECADES. THE PRESENT PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION, A BUS SYSTEM, FOCUSES ITS SERVICE INTO OUR CITY AND THE MAJOR ARTERIAL ROADS IN THE FAU SYSTEM ARE REALLY THE PRIMARY RIGHT-OF-WAY FOR THAT SYSTEM. IN ADDITION, THE NEW LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT SYSTEM WHICH IS PRESENTLY IN THE PROCESS OF BEING DESIGNED WILL HAVE US UTILIZE RIGHT-OF-WAY THAT LIES WITHIN THESE MAJOR ARTERIALS.

THE FACT OF THE MATTER IS THAT THESE ARTERIALS ARE AT THEIR CAPACITY NOW. IN SANTA ANA ALONE, WE NEED TO:

A. WIDEN IMMEDIATELY, MAIN STREET, BRISTOL STREET AND FIRST STREET, BOTH EAST AND WEST. THOSE PROJECTS TOGETHER WILL COST APPROXIMATELY $13 MILLION.

B. WE NEED TO PROVIDE PROPER TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEMS SO THE TRAFFIC CAN MOVE ALONG THOSE ARTERIAL SYSTEMS WITH BOTH COMPUTERIZED SIGNALS AND TRANSIT SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT PROJECTS THAT WOULD COST $15 MILLION.

Best Available Copy

C. WE NEED TO REPLACE AND REHABILITATE OUR STREETS. MANY OF WHICH ARE NOW 20 and 30 YEARS OLD.

D. MAJOR SANTA ANA PORJECTS AND THEIR COSTS FOR WHICH WE MUST DEPEND ON FEDERAL AND STATE PARTICIPATION ARE:

1. MAIN STREET BRIDGE WIDENING - $2 MILLION

2. ETC. (ON LIST)

IN THIS VERY SHORT PRESENTATION, I BELIEVE THAT YOU CAN SEE THAT THE OVERALL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM FOR ORANGE COUNTY, FOR CALIFORNIA, AND FOR THE COUNTRY BOILS DOWN TO THE ABILITY OF THAT SYSTEM TO DELIVER PEOPLE TO THEIR DESTINATION. IN A COUNTY LIKE ORANGE COUNTY, WITH SUCH RAPID GROWTH, THE PROBLEMS HAVE BECOME MAGNIFIED. IN ORDER FOR THIS SYSTEM TO FUNCTION PROPERLY, URBAN STREETS, PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION, AND RAIL COMMUTER LINES WILL BE ESSENTIAL. OUR CITY AND OTHER CITIES NEED FEDERAL AID URBAN FUNDS TO UPGRADE, REHABILITATE, AND MAINTAIN THIS SURFACE STREET NETWORK IF ALL OF THE BILLIONS OF DOLLARS IN CAPITAL INVESTMENT IN OUR FREEWAY SYSTEMS AND OUR INTERSTATE SYSTEM IS TO FINALLY FULFILL ITS GOAL OF AN ADEQUATE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM. WE ASK YOUR SERIOUS CONSIDERATION TO ADDRESSING THE

Best Available Copy

SANTA ANA CORRIDOR INTERSTATE PROBLEM AND IN FEDERAL LEGISLATION TO CONTINUE THE FOCUS TOWARD ASSISTANCE TO CITIES WITH FEDERAL AID URBAN FUNDS WHERE THOSE CITIES, LIKE SANTA ANA, ARE REQUIRED TO PROVIDE MAJOR INVESTMENTS IN ORDER TO HAVE THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM FUNCTION EFFECTIVELY.

Best Available Copy

Mr. **Anderson**. Please proceed.

TESTIMONY OF ROBERT W. LUXEMBOURGER, SANTA ANA VICE MAYOR; AND A. J. WILSON, SANTA ANA CITY MANAGER

Mr. **Luxembourger**. Congressman Anderson and Congressman Patterson, members of the Transportation Committee. I am R. W. Luxembourger, vice mayor of the good city of Santa Ana.

I would first like to welcome all of you to our good and fair city, notwithstanding the fog, however. We didn't order that up for you.

I would like to give a pitch to the importance of your presence, and helping you to cope with conditions and situations that we are here for. The problems that are faced by this county and the city are tremendous.

I would first like to extend the regrets of our good mayor, Gordon Bricken, who is unable to be present today. He is attending the Mayors' Conference in Boston. He wished me to pass to you his deep concern over the issues that are being brought here today.

In fact, I believe when we talk of local issues, we are really talking about a very large picture, and I look to use the word nationwide. It doesn't stop at anybody's city limits, county line or State line, as far as that goes.

The Santa Ana Freeway corridor is essential and vital to the efficient and effective functions of the economy of Orange County. You have heard this mentioned in the testimony that has been presented to you.

However, we from the city of Santa Ana would like to further explain the impact of this corridor upon us and the central city of the county. The growth in Orange County has seriously impacted our transportation network, which is used each day by 3 million people.

So many of these people are coming to where you sit today and conduct the business of Government and major business of the private sector of this county and city; 50,000 people alone come to industrial jobs directly related to that corridor. You have heard in previous testimony how the expansion of the corridor is essential. What we would like to bring before you today is specific ways in which our city, the city of Santa Ana, must interrelate its transportation system and that corridor in order for the system to be most effective, and cost effective, I might add.

We of the city council of the city of Santa Ana have invested a great deal of our local resources in attempting to address the transportation problems which far exceed the scope of our population.

It is through the partnership effort with the Federal-State government, that we can conceivably be successful. So appearing with me today are city manager, A. J. Wilson. At this time, I would like to give him the green light to move ahead and explain some of the specific problems that must be addressed in this transportation system, if it is to be functional.

So, without any further ado, Mr. Chairman, I would like to pass the podium over to Mr. Wilson.

Thank you very much.

Mr. **Anderson**. Mr. Wilson?

Mr. WILSON. Thank you, Mr. Luxembourger, and members of the committee. I guess it is most appropriate that the person you have when you are anxious to get to lunch is the city manager. We are sort of used to being in this position, and we will try to finish this as quickly as possible.

I think you have seen a broad overview of the kind of transportation problems that a county like Orange County faces. And one of the comments I would like to make to you, because I have been listening to the questioning relative to the general policy stance on transportation funding.

I think if you would look at Orange County as it really exists today, if there is any one example of what supposedly would be the symbol of success of a supply side increasing economy, it is Orange County.

In a real way, if the administration's economic program were to work, and all of us, of course, hope it will, it would be reflected in the kind of growth and investment that has occurred in this county in a short period of time.

I want to make that point because as one makes that point, then you can begin to see that from the testimony you received, in failing to invest in certain transportation infrastructure can inhibit, if not stop that growth, and therefore, when one is asked questions over what is important for the investment of the Federal dollar, it seems to me that it is vital that we look at transportation infrastructure investments as one of the essential pieces of the economic recovery program or whatever you want to call it.

Adding to that has been the corridor as you have discussed it, and I don't know how all of you got here today, but I presume some of you came down the Santa Ana Freeway, and after you got off the freeway, you got on a street, I don't know which of our streets——

Mr. ANDERSON. Jerry told us that was the only way we could get in.

Mr. WILSON. It is, really.

Mr. ANDERSON. We had to drive quite a ways out of our way to get in.

Mr. WILSON. Well, I have to sign helicopter permits, so I know you didn't come in by helicopter, because the only way somebody comes in by helicopter is over my signature.

As you went through that system, I think you might very simply see that the point of view of the local government, the city government in this whole picture, is simply that as the system is functioning, unless it can finally deliver people to their destination, the whole investment will fail, unless those investments can also be made.

The map to my left, and I wish I had one of Orange County as well, because if you looked at Orange County, you would see that Santa Ana sits right in the middle of the freeway systems, and the white band there is the Santa Ana Freeway, as it cuts through our city.

You see an awful lot of lines there, and I know you can't see them from the distance that you are sitting, but the point of the lines is that you have heard the fixed rail system talked about. The big red and the blue lines going north, south, east and west, are the pieces of that system which focus at this point at the center of the county.

The various other smaller lines are the major arterial streets that must lead people in and out of that freeway system if it is to function. As they cross at each location, even as we talk about expanding lane width of the freeway, you would find out that the freeway interchange today is totally inadequate to handle the levels of cars coming off of that into our street system.

Two of them, 17th Street, which is the—almost to the top of the line, red and green, going across, crossing the freeway, is an area where today the street goes from a fixed lane to a four-lane street under the freeway bridge, because it has not been replaced because of the oldness of the freeway.

And if you really want to find out what the problem is, I could take you up there at about 4:30 this afternoon, and you could see that no matter how many lanes were on the freeway, unless that can be improved, that freeway system is not going to function.

I just use that as one example of such interchanges. The surface road system, and the major arterials which we are having to try to expand, even the one which Councilman Griset mentioned in earlier testimony, which is East First Street, where the funds are being held up, presently trying to resolve the problem of the sanctions—of the air pollution sanctions of the Federal Government.

It has to be seen as an essential linkage between that freeway and where people are trying to go. We have a responsibility in this city to finance transportation improvements which far exceed the scope of the population of our community.

If I were just to take three major arterials, all of which are on the Federal Aid Urban System, which need immediate attention, Bristol Street, running north and south; Main Street, running north and south, which is where the red transit line actually is overlaid and shown; and First Street, running completely east and west through the city.

We would have to spend $15 million by today's standards just bring those roadways up to capacity. I won't bore you with a long list—and I heard an offer to provide subsequent testimony, and I would be happy to provide more detailed information that we have.

But the point that we are trying to make as a city, its that as you are looking at the transportation bills, let us remember that where people are going ultimately, and where they are coming from, primarily are within our cities. And be it their origin or their destination, for them to function within the broader transportation system, there have to be these linkage facilities.

That is what the Federal Aid Urban System was all about. It was not a program to finance local governments to do their job of fixing up their streets. We have thousands and thousands of miles of streets that the Federal Government has no relationship to in this community.

And it is up to our local taxpayers to come up with the money to maintain that portion of their infrastructure. But the Federal Aid Urban System is all about—are those streets which allow, No. 1, the freeway systems and the interstate systems of this country to feed people off to their destination.

No. 2, it is the right-of-way for most of our transit systems, the buses that Mr. Clark spoke about before; they all focus into this center. And we are providing the right-of-way for that to occur.

No. 3, the rights-of-way, as you can see from this map, for light rail transit in the future, will be those same facilities. If the national transportation system is to function, we feel that there must be a continuing recognition of that portion of the system that must be financed by our local governments, and that ongoing assistance under the Federal aid urban approach—or if you want to go block grant to something else—to recognize that reality is essential.

You had asked some questions earlier, and in listening to the questions, you were asking about choosing between expenditures, and I know you have that problem.

Once a year, I sit down and go over a budget, and in this day and age, and for the last 5 years of my life, I have never been able to say what do I want to buy? I have had to say, what can't I afford, and what am I going to have to explain?

And believe, me, I understand the problem.

Mr. ANDERSON. From which are you going to cut out that you also want?

Mr. WILSON. That is right. It seems to me that there is two pieces of that that have to be arrived at. No. 1, if I sit down and look at my budget, and don't have some clear idea from my city council as to the policies they want to carry out, that I am lost in trying to make the appropriate cuts.

And, No. 2, I have to make sure I am looking at the whole picture. So that if I have 18 departments, and I am trying to say what is the balance of this budget that will come out with a figure that I have to spend, and we have never had the luxury of deficits, so I have always had that bottom line sitting there.

I have to look at the balance of needs, making sure that I, as a manager, and the city council, in their role, can see the interrelationship of all the things, so we don't have a Cadillac piece of service here—say, a transportation facility, and the inability to keep it open because we don't have enough money in traffic enforcement in order to have people follow the law.

It seems to me that when you talk about a transportation system, that it is not, shall we have freeways or transit or local road improvements, it is, we have to have them all. And the question is what is the most important that has to function to make sure that the system, to the scope that we can afford it, can function?

And I think what you are dealing with in the legislation that is before you now, is not only raising questions of the amount of dollars, but what are the essential pieces that have to remain eligible in order for that system to work?

We would opt to you today that some form of assistance, and I am going to mention FAU, because it is the form in the Federal law today, is an essential piece in many areas of this country, most certainly in Orange County, Calif., and in Santa Ana, Calif., if we are to take all of the other investments and have them work effectively, to deliver people and goods from where they are to where they want to go.

With that, we will deliver our statements. I would be happy to answer any questions, Mr. Anderson.

Mr. **Anderson**. Well, thank you very much, Mr. Wilson.

I was involved during the early seventies in opening up the FAU urban program, so that it could be used for transit capital programs.

Have the cities in this area taken advantage of this provision?

Mr. **Wilson**. The cities in this area have taken advantage in a limited fashion, and that has been primarily including in right-of-way improvements, cutouts and other things related to the bus system.

On the other hand, I assure you that as we look down the line, and I work with a committee of the seven major cities that are affected by the proposed rapid system, that there would be the intention to commit to a balanced policy that would have those dollars going toward priority improvements, which would include transit improvements.

Mr. **Anderson**. Now, you have discussed the need to continue funding for the Federal aid to urban system, and I am inclined to agree that this program should be continued. The current funding level is $800 million a year. The administration wants to reduce the program to $500 million in fiscal year 1983, and then to eliminate it.

The Senate favors a funding level of $600 million for next several years. Have you given any thought to the appropriate funding level for this program?

Mr. **Wilson**. Well, of course, you could say as much as possible, but I follow the legislation to the extent that I can. First of all, I would support the Senate's approach for the very reason that you mention. It seems to me that the Senate, regardless of the funding level, although I think you mentioned they are now at $600 million.

Mr. **Anderson**. Which is $200 million less than what we felt it should have been.

Mr. **Wilson**. That is right. But there is also another caveat to what you have expressed, and that is one is a phaseout of the program, the other is an ongoing existence of the program. My point to this committee would be that I can't imagine that one could reach a point 3 years from now where you can say that the transportation system in the United States of America no longer has a need for the improvements of these major arterials that we in cities have to take care of.

And that the only further need is completion of certain segments of the Interstate System.

And so, therefore, to the extent that there is an ongoing presence, I think that is a reasonable approach. To the extent that you do a distribution of funding, I think you have expressed it before in some of your questioning, I think the real question has to be asked about how long can you reduce funds in specific categories and to what point do you go more to a block grant approach, where the expenditure capabilities are eligible, and the local communities can decide the priorities.

I think that is something that you are moving further and further toward, as you reduce the size of the overall pod. You know, we could have a ridiculous situation, as I am sure you are well aware, where everybody could be receiving a small program, and none of them would be sufficient to handle the burden of what was needed.

I think we, when you ask the question of a minimum funding level, I guess I would reverse it, I think there is a minimum where the funds, because of their "paupaucity," don't allow anybody to affect—that little green line, from the red line over just to the Santa Ana Freeway, which is First Street, going across the middle, that is a $3 million project.

And it is absolutely vital. And it is being done in a way just to get it done. I mean, it is a pauper approach to it. You are talking about many millions of dollars that are needed in cities of our size, and I am sure you could magnify this.

Now, we only get $500,000 a year, or something like that, you know, it would be a ridiculous approach to the whole question.

Mr. **ANDERSON**. Congressman Patterson?

Mr. **PATTERSON**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A. J., it is good to be in your city again. Mr. Chairman, this city manager probably made the greatest move in length and distance of any city manager I know. He came from Portland, Maine to Santa Ana. I can't imagine any greater distance. But the city has certainly done quite well, and A. J., your testimony and the questions asked by the chairman, I think pretty well cover the waterfront.

You indicated you would be brief because you knew it was lunchtime, and they always put city managers on there. Believe me, we are at 4 in the afternoon Washington time, so it is not even dinnertime for us. We can just sit around for the rest of the day.

And we do have other witnesses, but we appreciate your testimony, and particularly where it cuts down to four lanes, which I had forgotten, in at least one location, maybe others, on the Santa Ana Freeway.

Mr. **WILSON**. Grand Avenue, and Santa Ana Boulevard would be another location, Congressman.

Mr. **PATTERSON**. Grand Avenue and Santa Ana Boulevard is four lanes, OK. And are there any others that you are aware of?

Mr. **WILSON**. Well, the First Street actually is in the same situation. The viaduct goes over the highway. First Street is in the same situation, and the long-awaited viaduct on Main Street goes over the Santa Ana Freeway. You will recall from being there, the many calls and letters you received on that one. That is also a location where we have eked it out to about four and a half lanes, but that whole bridge will have to be replaced, in order for people to be able to move from the north into the city, north of the freeway to the south.

So there is four right off the top, where it is four lanes.

Mr. **PATTERSON**. These are the overpasses you are speaking of.

Mr. **WILSON**. Overpasses. Both in those two cases, it is where our streets go over the top. It goes from six to four. And the other two is where our streets are going underneath, it goes from six to four. So the same kind of problem is happening, and it will only become a greater problem as we expand the capacity on the interstate, because only that many more people are going to be trying to get off and on, and with the amount of growth, the little north end area of the city just north—where the top red dot—we presently have on the drawing board, two development proposals that would add 4 million square feet of office space to that location.

When that is introduced, they are given the capacities to go on and off that freeway. If you have driven the freeway at 5 at night, you just would have an idea of how far back people will be lined up, just trying to access the freeway system, unless something is done with the ramping systems that have to go along with that.

Mr. **Patterson**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Anderson**. Mr. Reida?

Mr. **Reida**. Well, I am not sure whether it is a question or an observation, Mr. Chairman, but I was listening to some of the prior witnesses, and they were talking about the need for flexibility, and I can certainly see that as someone charged for the day-to-day responsibility of responding to local citizens' concerns and complaints they would have that view.

But the point made by Mr. Wilson, I think, is something we have to keep in mind, and that is that the systems concept which is something as you well know, near and dear to my boss' heart, Don Clausen, who happens to be from the northern part of California.

And if we go along with the administration proposal and end up phasing out the A, B, C, D system as we know it, and return it back essentially as a block grant, I think we have to realize that there will be a real tendency to lose the system's concept that has been set up.

The function classification by the FHWA has contributed to the national transportation network. And the urban system, the secondary system, as a feeder from the rural and urban areas, have played a vital role in establishing that national highway network.

So that if we end up leaping to the temptation of flexibility, and essentially returning funds back on a block grant approach, we run the risk of losing those systems functioning the way that they were originally designed to do.

With that long kind of observation, what is your reaction to that?

Mr. **Wilson**. What do I think? I think if you—this map probably is the greatest example. I see this thing and shake my head sometimes, and yet I had it pulled together because we would keep talking about this has to be done and that has to be done.

I think you have got to combine responsibility. I think one can talk about a national transportation system, and I think that is the responsibility of the Congress, and I think that is part of the reason you are putting up dollars and cents to effectuate it. And that that should be remembered.

On the other hand, I think there is the side of it that says as one is deciding the priorities of implementation, there can be sense to saying to a community, "As things appear in your community right now, what is the most important piece of this system to be put into effect right now?" Based upon your local plan; based upon the fact that I know that if we sign 2 contracts in 60 days, there is going to be 5 million square feet of new office space, OK, located there.

And I am working on that, and Steve isn't working on that, the Federal Government isn't working on that. So I think there is a way. I tend to agree with you, if you just sort of say this is another local assistance program. If you go that far, you run the danger that you are talking about. I think there is a balance in between those where one can send resources, and then say, let's avoid the other extreme of the problem, which is where I think local flexibility in block grants came from, don't let somebody tell a certain community by a particular funding and a particular category, this is the most important priority to be effectuated in 1982, because it happened to be the most important priority in 55 percent of the constituent districts of the Congress, but allow for there always to be the mechanism to make that decision more locally.

FAU has had those characteristics, as you know, of local prioritization. So I think this system has not been without those aspects in it already.

Mr. REIDA. Well, perhaps this question should have been directed to Mr. Jenkins, but in 1978, I think Congress attempted—at least, the House—attempted to amalgamate those concerns by increasing the flexibility factor from transferring from one pot to another, but still retaining the integrity of the system's concept.

So that if your needs weren't actually on the secondary system, you had the ability to transfer to the primary or to the urban and vice versa. And I would be interested in how that is working, and if it has adequately addressed that concern or whether it ought to be changed?

Mr. WILSON. I don't know. Is Tom here? Maybe he should respond to that question. I have got my own response, but I hate to answer for somebody else.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Jenkins?

Mr. JENKINS. I might mention on that question, most of that was done at the State level, the transferring mechanism, rather than at the local level. And that is where we have some disagreement on how that was done.

Mr. Heckeroth from Caltran is aware of how that handled at the State—and there was movement between some, like 20 percent or something you could shift between some of the categories. It did not in any way increase our entitlement for FAU, even though you could transfer, it had to do with switching it between eligible systems, and giving some budget flexibility.

But in no way does it increase our entitlement, like to the local agencies. And our commission for the Federal aid urban program—I am not sure if that is a solution to some of the concern we have on flexibility. Just as a comment, I share your concern about the system concept matter, if you changed everything, the block grant, the whole matter, there would be some problem of holding the integrity of the Federal aid primary and the Federal aid interstate system together.

I think we would share concern on that as well as the State and other Federal agencies.

Mr. REIDA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ANDERSON. Thank you, Mr. Reida. Anything further?

Thank you very much, Mr. Wilson.

Mr. WILSON. Thank you.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do have two other people on my schedule here. One is Col. Jack Gill, USMC (retired), chairman of the OCTC Citizens Advisory Committee.

TESTIMONY OF JACK GILL, CHAIRMAN, OCTC CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Mr. Gill. My name is Jack Gill, I am chairman of the Orange County Transportation Commission Citizens Advisory Committee, which along with the technical committee, advisory committee and a policy advisory committee, has been mandated by the legislation which established the Transportation Commission for four of our counties.

The Orange County Transportation Commission has also seen fit to establish a social services advisory committee which has functioned quite well, as obviously noted in this morning's meeting of the commission.

I have been delegated by my committee to address two citizen-related issues which might not have been adequately covered in prior testimony.

The first is a highly emotional way, and I think your experience on the Santa Ana Freeway this morning and that of Mr. Patterson suffice it to say that the average Orange County citizen has spent much more time on the freeways than he used to, and the next 15 years, he will be spending approximately twice as much as he has, as he does today, despite some other large capital improvements projected and a lot of transportation system management procedures that are in the offing.

The fact that one of three usable lanes is often during peak hours clogged with traffic waiting to egress from the freeway. The fact that individual motorists frequently leave the freeway in an effort to find relief on surface streets, and often with very disappointing results.

Even Orange County transit district buses are authorized to do this on occasion, and they meet with the same fate at stoplights and other congested areas of the surface streets.

Peak hour travel is, of course, the problem. And with unpredictable frequency, normally slow traffic will come to a virtual standstill as it did this morning on the Santa Ana Freeway in the south part of the county, just because of a little fog and one or two minor accidents.

Yet, the travel time for me was doubled in driving here from Laguna Niguel this morning.

The second purpose is less emotional and more objective. And that is to assure the committee that citizen participation has and will continue to exert a strong influence on the ongoing studies involving the Santa Ana transportation corridor, and the entire multimodal transportation system.

There is in Orange County, as you heard, a growing transportation constituency, consisting of, first, the Commission and its staff, its advisory groups, the transportation coalition, League of Orange County Cities, the Orange County Chamber of Commerce, the League of Women Voters, and the Orange County Transit District.

Through their intensive educational efforts, public awareness of transportation problems and of possible solutions has been dramatically increased. Under the aegis of the transportation commission and the citizens advisory committee, a task force of approximately 85 concerned citizens met regularly during the alternatives analysis phase of the Santa Ana transportation corridor study.

Some measure of their effectiveness can be appreciated by comparing the original summary report with the final draft, which virtually all of the task force's recommendations were ultimately incorporated.

It is anticipated that during the ensuing stage 2 study, that this task force, with even greater staff and advisory committee support, would be considerably fortified in both numbers and experience.

And in closing, I would like to say that experience on this committee has been highly enjoyable for me and for every member of the committee. We get along very well; we get excellent support from the staff; and most of our recommendations—in fact, as far as I remember, all of them—have been followed through with—affirmatively by the commission itself. And it has been a marvelous experience for all of us.

Thank you.

Mr. **Anderson**. Thank you, Colonel.

Jerry, do you have any questions?

Mr. **Patterson**. No questions. Thank you, Colonel.

Mr. **Anderson**. Thank you very much, Colonel.

Our final witness is the gentleman I referred to earlier, Heinz Heckeroth, and Heinz is a truly outstanding official, I believe, in Caltrans, running their district 7, which includes both Los Angeles and Orange Counties. And the only disappointment I have, Heinz, is that I have held hearings in California where Caltrans is blasted a little more than today, and I don't want you to get the impression that everybody thinks you are doing such a great job.

Mr. **Heckeroth**. I heard some things that you didn't hear, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Anderson**. Anyway, Heinz, I think everybody here knows you—but Heinz does, we think, an exceptionally good job. And, Heinz, would you like to answer anything or add to anything to what you have heard here today?

TESTIMONY OF HEINZ HECKEROTH, CALTRANS

Mr. **Heckeroth**. I do not have prepared remarks, Mr. Chairman, Congressman Patterson. Just two things.

One, Caltrans does have, in law, a priority that they have followed statewide. Freeway maintenance and rehabilitation is the first priority. Safety is the second. Third is operational improvements.

And then others. Second, we are a heavy advocate of any strategy that takes into account ride-sharing. Whether it be the carpool, vanpool approach that we heard alluded to earlier by not only private enterprise by individuals as well, transit and certainly the facilities that will allow those strategies to operate on the road system, as well as on its private right-of-way.

So, with that, Mr. Chairman, I know the hour is late, any questions, I will be glad to answer.

Mr. **Anderson**. You heard my question a moment ago, I believe, to the supervisor, about what assurance Orange County has as to the priority status of the Santa Ana being in there for—when there is some money available.

I wonder if you have any comments on that? I know when we were holding our hearings on 86 and Coachella, there was a vagueness as to how you got an answer from the State. There were some people testifying that they thought they were priority primary, and others weren't so sure. They didn't know how they got in there; there was a little difference between, I guess, your transportation commission doing certain things and Caltrans doing others, although still being part of the same organization.

Could you comment about what steps they might do if they aren't already assured?

Mr. **Heckeroth**. Surely. We have a very elaborate programing process in the State as a result of the legislation 3 years ago at the State level that involves regional priority recommendations to the California Transportation Commission against the funds that are available, as well as State priority for the same number of funds.

That process is evolving, I think, very well. About 90 percent of what we would like to do, statewide, is contained in both the State and the regional recommendations. It is this upper 5 percent that we get into problems with, and they, admittedly, are a difference of perception between what is a statewide issue, versus a regional priority.

The best we can do at the State and regional level is to propose projects against the funds that are available that are most cost-effective. And I think we will never eliminate that grey area or that overlapping area where cost-effectiveness is questioned, concerning a few projects.

Mr. **Anderson**. Congressman Patterson?

Mr. **Patterson**. Does that mean Santa Ana Freeway is high up on the priority list?

Mr. **Heckeroth**. Santa Ana Freeway, unfortunately, comes under the color of money or the cookie jar principle, which, in effect—and I would take exception to Supervisor Clark's comments that Orange County never got its fair share—and this illustrates——

Mr. **Anderson**. That is to get your attention.

Mr. **Heckeroth**. Orange County, when it was a low-population county, had a great deal of highway investment in infrastructure, as a result of the initiation of the interstate program, as well as earlier State highway investments. And the Orange County example certainly is the Santa Ana Freeway, the first freeway.

So it was built to address the needs of its day, and the 20-year projections related to its day, and unfortunately, the succeeding growth, subsequent growth in this area has overwhelmed that particular facility.

But it is an attractive facility as a diagonal route through the county, and I am afraid that no matter how much we widen that, it would continue to be an attractive route, and as a result of that, have all the customers that it could possibly have.

But under the interstate program, that is essentially a completed interstate freeway. And when we come back to upgrade it, we need to use our primary pod. And the primary pod, as you well might know, in California, and I imagine in other States, has a long list of projects against it.

86 was identified as one, the Imperial County project as one that has statewide significance.

4-R will go toward providing some ability on the part of the State to bring money to an upgrade program, where an interstate facility, in effect, has already been bought by the Federal FHWA.

Mr. ANDERSON. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDERSON. Heinz, I am sure Jerry knows that perhaps he may not be thoroughly aware of the difference between the 3-R and the 4-R that we are adding. As to why, under the 3-R, you can't do much because you are limited basically to shoulders and things, and under the 4-R we can get into construction and reconstruction.

You might tell him the importance of what adding the fourth R of the 4-R would be, I would think, to the Santa Ana, as a possibility.

Mr. HECKEROTH. I think the difference in my perception is in the two words. One is rehabilitation. That is, taking that existing freeway that has already been bought by the Federal Highway Administration as meeting the 20-year growth needs as the day it was built.

Mr. PATTERSON. And that would be what Santa Ana is today?

Mr. HECKEROTH. So we can upgrade the pavement; rehabilitate those sections that may be in distress; we can upgrade that facility with respect to safety devices; new signing approaches; pavement marking approaches; perhaps provide shoulders where they do not exist; that kind of a retrofit program to that existing facility.

But we cannot add new lanes. Or we cannot add to the lane width of bridges, either under or over, as was alluded to in four instances by the city of Santa Ana.

Mr. PATTERSON. But if Congress adopts the fourth R——

Mr. ANDERSON. In the bill was passed, we do have 4 R's. The fourth R is in there.

Mr. PATTERSON. Then what will that mean?

Mr. HECKEROTH. There it will mean that we will begin to prioritize that aspect of the needs statewide, and obviously we don't need to say it again, there are going to be a longer list of needs to address than the funds available in any expanded purpose to which you put the funds.

So——

Mr. PATTERSON. What sort of formula do you expect to compete for this——

Mr. HECKEROTH. A formula that would combine a delay index, or a congestion factor, and a safety factor against the cost of doing the facility, in a cost-effectiveness approach.

Mr. PATTERSON. Condition of the freeway, congestion, that sort of thing?

Mr. HECKEROTH. Yes. And we are not forgetting, even under the current circumstances, the Santa Ana Freeway. Because we do have congestion relief in sight on certain reaches as we develop freeway operational improvements. Restriping, adding lanes for short reaches.

Mr. **Patterson**. You mentioned that you differed with Supervisor Clark on almost nothing has ever been done for the county, and your illustration was the highway system that was built back in the days when this was Orange County—smog-free Orange County, instead of orange-free Smog County—the—and I guess we would all agree with that.

We had orange trees, and we built the freeway. The freeway, of course, the significance of that to many of us who live here today, was that it brought a lot of people here.

Now those people have needs for additional freeway. It seems to me, then, that perhaps the State and Federal Government have, by putting a freeway where there were trees, has caused the areas to open up, more public investment and city growth and population, and now, by not recognizing the need to broaden and expand those freeways, you are, in effect, saying we built it for the orange trees to get from Los Angeles to San Diego, and that is all that we ever had in mind.

Is that what you are saying to us today? I am not sure. It sounded that way.

Mr. **Heckeroth**. Partially. I think if you look at the traffic on that Santa Ana Freeway, most of it is intracounty traffic. Looking at it from the statewide perspective, than are we—or the Federal interstate perspective—than are we sizing for long-range use or are we sizing for short-range use, and then, if you dissect the population that way, the user population, you have a different funding mechanism you apply to the short-range trip versus the long trip.

And I think that is what we are getting into, and I think we are aware, certainly, Irvine Corp. has been supportive of State highway improvements, overcrossings, by total funding, total local funding for those improvements.

In effect, recognizing, under a low funding kind of reality, that in order to retrofit or increase capacity on a system, that local participation needs to be created and, in effect, done.

Mr. **Patterson**. Maybe there needs to be more local participation on the highway system.

Mr. **Heckeroth**. That is a difficult chore to, you know, adjudicate in an equitable way, but certainly the trend is in that direction.

Mr. **Patterson**. The city manager testified that a whole lot of miles and miles and miles, far and away a greater percentage of streets are locally maintained, and that the exceptions are in State highways and Federal highways.

Well, I suppose we could go on indefinitely, and the hour is growing late. Let me just ask you one last question.

How would you feel about committee language in the committee report on the House side or conference report when the conference legislation is adopted by and agreed upon between the House and the Senate, that would direct the Department of Transportation to work closely with Caltrans? Do you see that as a positive thing, not written in the legislation, but in the conference and committee reports, directing the working closely together with Caltrans?

Do you think that would achieve a positive goal——

Mr. **Heckeroth**. Federal, State——

Mr. **Patterson**. Is that unnecessary?

Mr. **Heckeroth**. Federal, State?

Mr. **Patterson**. Yes. The Department of Transportation.

Mr. **Heckeroth**. We do now, I believe.

Mr. **Patterson**. What do you think? It would be helpful or unnecessary? Or some other category? Is it going to be helpful to have that kind of language in there to——

Mr. **Heckeroth**. Any time that you indicate who you wish the decisionmakers to be; what you want to emphasize, I think intent language is always helpful.

Mr. **Patterson**. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Anderson**. Anything further?

Mr. **Reida**. No, sir.

Mr. **Anderson**. Thank you very much, Heinz, for your presentation. I do not have anyone else scheduled. I know the time is late. There may be someone else that has something. Jerry?

Mr. **Patterson**. I just have one thing to mention, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Anderson**. Congressman Patterson.

Mr. **Patterson**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

About 10 days ago, I sent out a random notice of this hearing indicating to people that they might participate as an average citizen via either attending the hearings or by responding to me in Washington, whereby I would be submitting their response to the subcommittee.

I don't know if there is anyone here that showed up, but many people have responded. The mail had barely enough time to get here, and yet, we have had greater than a 1-percent return already. And of that, 98.4 percent have indicated that they believe that even though we have budgetary problems and that balancing the budget is important the 4–R program and the reconstruction of the Santa Ana Freeway was high on their priority list, even if it meant the expenditure of additional Federal funds.

And only a very few responses, less than 2 percent, indicated that they did not wish to see this proceed. I thought that this response was pretty good. That was randomly selected. The returns are still coming in. But so far, it is 98.4.

Mr. **Anderson**. Well, Jerry, I would like to say that if whatever you have, we would like to have it. if you want to give us the individual mail, or if you want to give us the synopsis, or the report, in the form anyway you wish. We would like to have it.

Mr. **Patterson**. I thank you, Mr. Chairman, very much. I have nothing further.

Mr. **Anderson**. Nothing further then, I think is a good time to adjourn the subcommittee.

[Whereupon, at 1:33 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

○